

INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS



BY

N. A. RICHARDSON

Author of "Introduction to Socialism," "Methods of
Acquiring Possession," "Railroads and Reform." etc.



CHICAGO

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY

1911

X9::73

E

22379

Copyright, 1909

By N. A. RICHARDSON

PREFACE.

This book is intended for use in the general propaganda work of the Socialist party. I believe it contains the sort of matter that should be in the hands and heads of the producing masses of our country. I have set down the things that I think all should know, and have endeavored to state them in language that they can easily follow.

There are few of our citizens but realize that there is much that is wrong in matters industrial, many things that should and must be remedied. They know that we are facing serious economic problems; but they do not know either the nature or the scope of those problems. Then it follows that they do not know that those problems have a common origin and therefore a common solution. To teach that lesson is the chief mission of this work.

I have hewn sufficiently close for all practical purposes to what is technically scientific in Socialist philosophy. My ambition is to get some truths into people's minds and to do this I have endeavored to keep within range of easy comprehension. The author is willing to submit to adverse criticism, if any see fit to administer it, if only he can impress upon his fellow men the great lesson to be learned from the industrial conditions that now obtain. If he can aid his readers in a sane interpretation of the events in which they are personally taking part, he shall have accomplished much and will be richly rewarded in that accomplishment.

N. A. RICHARDSON.

San Bernardino, California,

April 20, 1909.

CONTENTS

PART I. THE PROBLEMS.

	<i>Page.</i>
I. IN OUTLINE	9
II. THE ASSUMPTION	10
III. THE TWO DOLLARS' WORTH.....	12
IV. THE EIGHT DOLLARS' WORTH.....	20
V. THE CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH.....	29
VI. CORRUPTION	51
VII. THE UNEMPLOYED	76
VIII. PANICS	96
IX. ENSLAVEMENT OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN.....	109
X. DEGENERACY	132
XI. INDUSTRIAL WARS	141
XII. INTERNATIONAL WARS	159
XIII. THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC	165

PART II. SOME VITAL TOPICS.

I. PROPERTY—COLLECTIVE AND PRIVATE.....	175
II. LABOR	183
III. THE FARMER	192
IV. GOVERNMENT	197
V. PROGRAM, ORGANIZATION AND TACTICS.....	203
VI. CRITICS	216

INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS

PART I.

THE PROBLEMS

I.

IN OUTLINE

The people of the United States, in common with those of all enlightened nations, are today confronted by some of the most momentous and far-reaching industrial problems that ever engaged the minds of men.

These problems are far-reaching in that they are simultaneously agitating the people of every land; and they are momentous in that their solution involves revolutionary measures.

While they are world wide in their scope, yet customs, governments and international law are such that each nation must, to a very great degree, solve the problems for itself and make application of its solution through the channels of its own institutions.

To such proportions has each of these problems developed in our country that evidence of the existence of one or more of them is everywhere apparent; and the necessity for some sort of remedy is keenly felt by every intelligent and humane citizen. The question is only what and how?

The most important of these problems may be enumerated as follows:

1. The concentration of the ownership of wealth.

2. Corruption in all walks of life—official and non-official.
3. The unemployed masses of labor.
4. Intermittent periods of business depression known as panics.
5. The practical enslavement of women and children in our industries.
6. Degeneracy among all classes from the palace to the slum.
7. Strikes, lockouts, boycotts—war between employers and employed.
8. International wars.
9. The liquor traffic.

Here are nine great evils. Each is a bar to human progress; each is, to a greater or less degree, inimical to national life. Like diseases they are upon us and necessity for their cure is imperative. The task then set before us is to find the source of these evils and the consequent remedy for them. If investigation discloses that they have their origin in a common cesspool, that they spring from a common cause, the question of how to deal with them is very much simplified.

II.

THE ASSUMPTION

A casual survey of the problems enumerated in the preceding paragraphs reveals them all as, at base, industrial; and an analysis, though it may be superficial, of the system of industry co-existent with them, forces upon us the fact that they are each and all incidental to that system.

This is a sweeping indictment, and, if it can be sustained, means that the system of industry against which it lies has served its usefulness.

As a basis for the argument that is to follow, we must make an assumption. This is necessary because it is not now possible to obtain exact figures on the matter in hand. Let us assume that the *retail price* of what is produced by an average day's labor in the industries of the nation is \$10.

It is here meant to include among those who labor in the industries only those who do really needful labor. The nation swarms with hurrying, grasping busybodies and supernumeraries, most of whom are thriving fairly well, but who are about as essential to productive industry as are fleas to the well-being of a dog. They work, it is true. Yes, they work, themselves, and they work other people; but the nation's wealth is not increased thereby. It is meant here to include only those doing such labor, mental or manual, as is essential to the highest achievements of civilization. All these, whether they be farmers, mechanics, hod carriers, teachers, doctors, nurses, or trainmen are necessary to production and are, therefore, productive laborers. The assumption is, that the average day's labor of each of these industrially necessary laborers produces what retails over the counters of the nation for \$10. The figures may be a little high or low. That does not materially concern us.*

*From the author's insight as a merchant into the matter of factory, wholesale, jobber's and retail prices, as well as from a careful study of the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor and such government documents as Bulletins 57 and 93, U. S. Census of Manufactures, 1905, he is convinced that the estimate of \$10 is reasonable. For reasons that may become more apparent as this volume is perused, it is very difficult to obtain anything like exact figures on much that concerns profits and investments. Bulletin 57, page 10, tells us: "Census statistics are too general, and the reports are not prepared in a manner to justify their use for computing the returns to capital invested or the amount of capital required for a given product." Our courts have decided that a Mr.

In the industrial system that now obtains in all civilized countries and that is known as the capitalist system, that \$10 worth of produce is divided into two parts. These parts have but one characteristic in common—they each originate in productive labor. The \$10 worth of goods is solely the result of productive activity; the produce is the embodiment of all useful, socially necessary labor. Otherwise these parts have nothing in common.

One part goes to the laborer who does the needful work; the other part does not go to him, but to another or others.

Again let us assume that the part that goes to the laborer (as his wage) is \$2 worth.* Then \$8 worth goes elsewhere.**

We must now follow the \$2 worth and the \$8 worth each to its destination and observe the function that it fulfills in human affairs.

III.

THE TWO DOLLARS' WORTH

We have assumed that the labor essential to production—to maintaining and advancing civilization—receives as

Harriman need not answer questions, even in court, that may reveal "business secrets," though (or because) those "secrets" involve a violation of law on the part of a corporation so flagrant that it has become a national disgrace. Out of court, then, we must not expect such as he to make any startling revelations.

*The average daily wage of all wage-earners of this nation is less than \$2 for each day of actual labor. Census Bulletin No. 57 previously cited reports 5,470,321 wage-earners constantly employed in 216,292 establishments, representing all forms of industry, receiving as their annual wage \$2,611,540,532, or an average for each worker of \$477.40. That is \$1.52 per each of 313 days. Even for one especially selected week, the workers averaged but \$1.67 per day. Including officers and all in these establishments, they averaged but \$1.70 per day or \$531.60 per year.

** It will be observed that if future and more exact figures should

compensation for expended energy and skill, an average of \$2 (or \$2 worth of produce) per day. In the discussion of such matters as we have in hand, we can logically deal only with averages. The fact that certain isolated laborers, or even small groups of laborers, may receive more than \$5 per day and certain others less than \$5 per month, does not here concern us. The average is the essential consideration. Nor are we concerned with the concrete question of the sufficiency or insufficiency of this average.

The question is, *what is this \$2 worth that goes to labor?* The answer is, *it is the market price (or exchange value) of a commodity.*

This is the point that must be made clear. This is the fact, the principle, upon which the capitalist system of industry is based—the one thing that, in existing conditions, makes possible its ravenous, legalized robbery—the exploitation of labor.

Our markets or stores are but a collection of commodities; our merchants and traders deal with nothing else. Commodities are things evolved through the process of production with the general purpose in view of exchanging them for other commodities.*

When one goes to market and purchases, for instance, the commodity known as a bicycle, what does his payment include? He pays interest (or dividends) on the stocked

reduce the \$10 and consequently the \$8, the \$2 is already reduced, so the ratio of the part that goes to labor to that which does not, would still hover around 2:8 or 1:4. That is, labor can purchase in the markets about one-fifth of its product; or, in other words, this system of industry exploits labor out of about four-fifths of what it produces.

*"Whoever directly satisfies his wants with the produce of his own labor, creates, indeed, use-values, but not commodities. In order to produce the latter, he must not only produce use-values, but use-values for others, social use-values." Marx: "Capital," page 8.

valuation (principally water) of an iron mine; for the wear and tear of machinery used in working the mine; for the ingredients used in blasting, etc.; for the labor employed in getting out the ore; for transporting the ore to the smelter; for the smelting of the ore into steel, and dividends on several times the amount of money invested in the plant; for the transportation of the steel product to the various factories where the different parts are made, and dividends on several times the cost of the transporting medium; for the labor of making the various parts, for incidental expenses, including salaries often for useless, decorative functionaries that spend half their time in Europe, corruption funds used on city councils, politicians, legislatures and for campaign purposes; for interest on every dollar invested in labor or incidentals, and dividends on stocks representing several times the cash invested in the factories; for transportation of the various parts to the "bicycle factory" where they will be assembled, and again dividends on several times the cost of the railways; for the labor of assembling the parts and, again, incidentals, often supernumeraries and dividends on all investments (generally including interest on borrowed capital) and on one or many times the amount invested in the plant; for transportation to the wholesaler and dividends on the watered stock of the transporters; for the labor necessary to handling the goods in wholesaling, rent for building, interest on borrowed capital, cost of advertising and traveling salesmen,* often, as before, inci-

*A traveling salesman, who had for years represented (and still represents) one of the great wholesale houses of Chicago, told the author that the manager of the establishment showed him wherein it was necessary to sell their goods at an advance of at least 50% on the factory price, because an allowance of at least 30% must always be made as the cost of selling the goods,—for advertising, correspondence and salesmen—or, as he worded it, "It costs 30% to sell the goods."

In the city in which the author lives—about 15,000 population—

dentials and, over all, a big margin of profit to the firm; for transportation to the jobbers (including always the watered dividends) and here again a duplication of every item enumerated for the wholesaler—labor, rent, interest, salesmen, advertising, license, taxes, incidentals, losses and profits; for transportation (and the regular profits) to the retailer, and, again, a full duplication of every item enumerated for the wholesaler. And the fact must not here be overlooked, that the rate of profit to the wholesale, jobbing and retailing concerns must be such a per cent as will support from two to twenty times the number of such establishments as would be required if industry were thoroughly organized and the unnecessary, parasitic elements eliminated.

This is an outline, though incomplete, of the bills that the purchase money meets when the bicycle is retailed. Should it be a source of surprise to learn that \$2 paid for needful labor must, in some manner, be transformed into \$10 worth of goods at the retail counter? The process of transformation will appear as we proceed with our investigation.

This is the process, in the main, through which commodities must pass in capitalist production.

The term "production" is here used in its broadest sense as including all labor expended upon a commodity, from the time the original raw material lies in one of nature's store-

he has, from careful observation, extending through a number of years, learned that the cost to his community of traveling salesmen is nearly equal to the entire sum expended by the city on a splendid system of public education, including a high school.

This city's annual advertising bill is at least \$75,000, sufficient, in a few years, to build every needed bridge and pave every street. Yet, if an attempt were made to annually collect from our people, by direct methods, such a sum for street improvement, it would at once dislodge every official connected with "such high-handed methods of administration."

The defenders of capitalism may tell us how much our national wealth is increased through the efforts of salesmen and advertisers.

houses, until it ceases to be a commodity by passing into the hands of a consumer.

But such is the capitalist system of production that the productive laborers must expend ten hours of labor for a wage that can command only what two hours of that labor creates. The rest of his time is spent in producing what must support the numerous parasitic elements that throng the entire course from raw material to consumer. And this condition is imposed upon these laborers, as we shall shortly see, because they can subsist upon what they can produce in the two hours. The parasites subsist upon what is produced in the other eight.

Let us not further digress nor too far anticipate. What does one pay for the bicycle or any other commodity? *One pays the cost of its production, in the conditions that obtain at the time of purchase.* Or, more strictly speaking, one pays what it costs to produce another to take the place of the one sold. Speaking generally, competition among sellers prevents extended necessity for one's paying more than this, and bankruptcy of an individual seller prevents extended opportunity for one's paying less.

There is, however, one commodity that is the possession of every laborer, that is not a tangible object, that is not stored away upon shelves or in warehouses; yet it has a distinctive existence and ranks in importance far above any other. It is to the discussion of this commodity that all that has been previously said is introductory. That commodity we call labor-power,* or the physical strength,

*"The capitalist epoch is therefore characterized by this, that labor-power takes in the eyes of the laborer himself the form of a commodity which is his property; his labor consequently becomes wage labor. On the other hand, it is only from this moment that the produce of labor universally becomes a commodity." Marx: "Capital," page 149.

mental capacity and manual skill necessary to produce things—to work in the industries.

This commodity, like any other, is brought to the market by its owner who cannot consume it and offered in exchange for some other commodity that he can consume. It is bought by some one who desires it for consumption and who exchanges for it a commodity that he cannot consume.

What is paid for this commodity by its purchaser? Just what is paid for any other commodity; as we have already seen, the cost of its production, or, more strictly speaking, the cost of its reproduction, in the conditions that prevail wherein it is reproduced.* In other words, the purchaser (employer) must pay the seller (laborer) a wage that will purchase for him whatever is necessary for his subsistence—for his replacement by at least one other laborer when his productive career has ended.

What then is the minimum of commodities that must average to fall to the lot of *every man*? What is this "subsistence"?

Sufficient must go to each, through the labor of the "bread winner" or "bread winners" of his family,** to provide food, clothing and shelter for a man and a woman and to enable them to rear to manhood and womanhood at least two children; and, of course, more than two, if there is to

*"The value of labor-power is determined, as in the case of any other commodity, by the labor-time necessary for the production, and consequently also for the reproduction of this special article." Marx: "Capital," page 149.

The reader will observe that Marx uses the term "labor-time" and not "cost." In "Capital" he demonstrates that commodities that are produced by equal labor-times, that is by equal numbers of hours of labor (all kinds of labor being reduced to a common denomination—unskilled, simple labor) averages, in like conditions, to have equal exchange value. But his philosophy is too elaborate to here unfold and we shall, therefore, adhere to the common and simple, though less exact term "cost."

**"The world over, when it becomes necessary for the wife or

be an increase in population. A bachelor or a childless home, therefore, represents a deficit. Somebody must make up the deficiency, for certain it is this average must be maintained. Rearing to manhood and womanhood implies all expenses incident to training for life whether that training be moral, mental or physical; and it must be such training as is, on the average, required to meet the conditions imposed at the time and in the country where the children are reared. These constitute the minimum average requirements of every man, and the expense they impose is the minimum average wage of the worker.

In short, a wage-worker comes to market with a commodity, labor-power, and exchanges it for other commodities that are its equivalent. And he cannot realize through this exchange more than the equivalent any more than can a farmer realize for his corn other commodities of greater value than that which he offers in exchange. The commodities exchanged are equivalents because the cost of production of the one is equal to that of the other. The cost of producing labor-power is the cost of producing the commodities that constitute the subsistence of the laborer. More than this subsistence, then, the laborer cannot average to command,* any more than can a seller of anything else

wife and children, to work in factories, it very soon becomes necessary for them to do so to support the family. The wages of the head of the family and the earnings of the entire family as before just maintain the standard of comfort among that class of the population. Professor E. W. Bemis has called attention to the fact that in the textile industries of Rhode Island and eastern Connecticut, where the women and children work, the earnings of the entire family are no greater than in other industries, like those in metal, in western Connecticut, where only the man works." Ely: "Political Economy," page 221.

*The value of a man is, as of all other things, his price—that is to say, so much as would be given for the use of his power." Th. Hobbes, quoted by Marx: "Capital," page 140.

"It has been the opinion of many of the ablest political economists for over a century that what is technically called *standard of*

average to get "more than it is worth." In the capitalist system, therefore, the wage-workers, the real producers, the mass of humanity whose labor is exploited through the process of production, cannot, on the average, command a wage that provides more than such a subsistence as will supply the general labor market with laborers of requisite efficiency.

And it is this wage that the \$2 worth pays; it is this subsistence that the \$2 worth supplies.

The commodities that constitute this subsistence the laborer, under our assumption, produces in one-fifth of his average day's work.

This one-fifth part of the sum total of labor is what is known in Socialist philosophy as "necessary-labor" and it comprehended every form of actual and necessary labor. The rest of that sum total, we characterize as "surplus-labor" and its product as "surplus-product"—"surplus-value."

It follows, therefore, that all except the necessary laborers must subsist upon this surplus-product of labor; and since the mass of humanity that thus subsists are in no way essential to production, they are essentially parasitic. And such is the capitalist system of production that this mass regularly appropriates about four-fifths of labor's product.

Nor can the laborer's share of his product long vary

life, or standard of comfort, determines the wages of labor. This means that laborers have an habitual standard of life, a certain style of life, and that what they receive as wages enables them on the average just to keep up this standard, but to do no more. They are able to occupy such sort of dwelling, or wear such clothes, to eat such food, and generally to do such things as this standard requires, but no more. . . . There is so overwhelming an array of facts, gathered from widely separated countries and from periods so distant from one another, which confirm this conclusion, that it is difficult to resist it."—Professor Richard T. Ely (University of Wisconsin): "Political Economy," page 221.

materially from this subsistence wage. Like the seller of any other commodity, the owner of labor-power finds that competition from other sellers (laborers) will prevent its extended sale above the cost of production. And as bankruptcy awaits him who long protracts the sale of other commodities below the production cost, so degeneracy, bankruptcy of labor-power, awaits the laborer who must long part with his power below its cost of production.

IV.

THE EIGHT DOLLARS' WORTH

We have now followed the \$2 worth of labor's product on its mission and learned its sole function. It pays for the subsistence of the laborer—for the reproduction of labor-power. It is the equivalent of the product of the laborer's first two hours' work of each day and is by him consumed. Except as it reappears in the form of labor-power, it becomes as if it never had been.

The rest of his day's product, the surplus part that we represent by the \$8 worth, has a very different work to perform.

Since \$10 worth represents the entire product—the entire supply of produce—it, of course, represents *the limit of the nation's average daily power to meet the requirements of the people*. Every payment made, no matter by whom nor when nor where, must be made from it. We cannot speak into existence means of payment. If payment is made, the means for its making—the possibility of making it—lies in the products of labor of this or of past years. Commodities must be produced before they can be exchanged and consumed. The suspension of their produc-

tion would necessarily destroy all means for meeting obligations. And since the \$2 worth supplies only the living of the laborer, it follows that the \$8 worth must average to meet every other demand of the nation.

Out of this \$8 worth, then, has been builded the railways, business blocks, factories, highways and mansions of the nation. Out of it is paid all dividends, interest, profit and rent. It supports tens of thousands of wholesale and retail establishments that an economical organization of business and industry would render useless. It sustains every wealthy idler in luxury and pays the princely salary of many a useless functionary. It builds every pleasure yacht and pays the price of every purchased prince. It is the source of all the millions squandered in the degrading practices of mammon's aristocracy. It builds every battleship, equips every battalion and speeds them to their work of destruction. It furnishes the blood and sinew of an industrial tyranny more menacing, more powerful than was ever that of priest or potentate. It buys legislatures, congresses and councils. It crowns the political boss and baffles every effort to establish a rule of righteousness. It taints pulpits and tyrannizes over our institutions of learning. And every cent of it is extracted from labor's product through the system of industry known as capitalism.

Strange, is it not, that such a system of exploitation could long be continued in a community that lays claim to being civilized? Evidently *it is the method of its doing that makes it at all possible*; and it is this method that now demands attention.

There are two modes for levying a tax upon a people—the direct and the indirect. A direct tax is levied by a legally constituted body as a certain per cent of the assessed valuation of all property within the territory whose people create that body. These assessments are levied upon all the

property of a State by a State Board or Commission regularly authorized to make such levy; and funds so collected are used for defraying the expenses of conducting the state's affairs and for maintaining its institutions such as schools, universities, asylums, penitentiaries, militia, etc. A County Commission, variously designated in different states, levies a similar tax upon all assessed valuations in a county for defraying the county's expenses; a city council levies in like manner upon city property.

This tax, as we see, has solely a property basis, and as soon as it has been determined, every one who must contribute to its payment knows the exact amount of his contribution. And more than this, and a matter concerning which Mr. Taxpayer is very critical and exacting, he knows just for what that money is to be used. He demands an itemized statement of all receipts and expenditures and that this statement shall, at all times, be open for public inspection. He has auditors, experts and grand juries appointed to see that nothing is concealed, that all funds are used for the purposes for which the tax was levied. He must know before making payment just what his money is paid for and he demands the subsequent history of every dollar that leaves his purse.

An indirect tax is such as duties on imports, internal revenue such as is levied upon tobacco, alcoholic beverages, or other articles of internal commerce. One may pay it or not, as he determines to use or not use the articles upon which it is levied. It is collected at no definite period and the great mass of its payers each contribute but from a fraction of a cent to a few cents at a time. Millions of them do not realize or even know that they are being taxed at all.

This is the sort of tax that supports in largest measure all national governments and that of our own country entirely. It is the sort of levy that creates least friction, meets

least opposition and is most easily collected. It is inconspicuous, and usually popular with the ruling (owning) class.

A casual survey of the system of exploiting the productive labor of our country reveals that that system is closely allied to the indirect method of taxation. So thoroughly concealed is the whole process of extraction of that greater fraction of labor's product that, though it has gone on for many decades in ever increasing volume, the mass of laboring humanity are still ignorant of its nature or extent or even of its existence. They fail entirely in realization of what they are indirectly paying; they fail even to realize that they pay at all. A great statesman is quoted as saying to his parliament, in substance, that by indirect methods, the nation could be taxed into poverty in two years and relatively little opposition would be engendered; but if equal sums were collected by direct methods, six months would produce a revolution. Is this more surprising than the fact that American labor is, by indirect methods, "taxed" into slavery even of women and children and yet millions refuse so much as to investigate the process?

For the purpose of expanding the thought in the preceding paragraph, or of putting it in more concrete form, let us assume that the exploitation of labor were attempted by direct methods. In that case, all productive laborers must average to be paid, say, at the end of each month, the full \$10 per day, and the exploiters must proceed to assess them directly for payments that are now made from the products of labor's creation.

In such a system the laborer would, of course, be called upon to part with what had actually come into his possession—to pay cash directly from his own pocket. Like the man called upon to pay a direct tax, he would at once become inquisitive regarding the disposition of his contribu-

tions. He would call for an itemized statement of receipts and expenditures.

The exploiters, like a state, county or city commission, must determine in advance for just what purpose an assessment must be made, and then levy upon the laborers to foot the bills. Let us take at least a cursory view of the workings of such an arrangement.

A levy of many millions must be made for the construction and maintenance of educational institutions of every required degree; for hospitals, asylums, homes for the helpless, museums, gymnasiums, theaters and all such necessary public institutions. Such a levy would, of course, meet with universal approbation.

The second list of items might concern transportation. It would contain a call for many needed millions for extensions, for maintenance and for repairs. Then follows the demand for hundreds of millions for dividends on funded debts and on stocks. Of course two-thirds of this funded debt and stock represents absolutely nothing but the vote of a board of directors and a few hours' run of a printing press; and the other third, representing the actual cost of the road, was assessed from labor during years that are gone. That is immaterial (so might argue the levying board); we exploiters must have this levy. These dividends constitute our private property and are therefore ours by sacred right. We have a right to interest on our former assessments (our accumulations through industry and thrift), and as for the water, to reject that would be barbarous. A large part of it (but never a controlling interest) has been sold to innocent (or ignorant) purchasers among whom are widows and orphans. Be reasonable and generous. Put up the cash. Pay like men. You know we must learn to live and let live.

Then there follows another item in the railroad list. It is for a few millions that are necessary for conducting, in

up to date form, political conventions and campaigns; for the installation through the medium of our bosses, newspapers and orators of a proper and patriotic spirit. We must send into office only men who will conserve the best interests of the people and this is generally very expensive. City councils, legislatures and congresses must be looked after in detail and they are also an enormous and constantly augmenting draft upon our revenues. They must all live and you must let live. Pay up.

Again, under the various headings for running such industries as railroads, oil, steel, coal, etc., we would find assessments sufficient to pay a princely salary to a president who has not for years been at the company's chief place of business. But his salary and his annual millions that now soar almost to the hundred mark must be paid. It is very necessary that he dispense a few millions as a philanthropist by way of building libraries or making donations to institutions of learning. All this is essential to the people's welfare. The levy must stand. Pay up.

Other items would call for such small matters as probably from \$80,000 to \$100,000 per year each for the maintenance and support of some delectable personages like Harry K. Thaw; for an annual expenditure of half a million on a De Castellane or a De Sagan, and a like sum for the support of each one of a score or more other such distinguished Europeans. And this would be followed by a call for a round number of millions for the year-round entertainment of a "smart-set" including their balls, theaters, suppers, multiple residences, dog teas, monkey dinners, free love, debaucheries and divorces. But all these "blessings" are of the regular order. You must pay.

Then a United States senator, or one of the chief makers of such an important functionary, wants a foreign dude for his daughter. They come a little high, but their possession

will remove much of what would otherwise be a future necessity for the employment of expensive experts to trace genealogies through lines that lead to titled ancestry and to the consequent right to the coat of arms of some foreign and probably defunct line of degenerates. Furthermore, these made-to-order pedigrees are always open to suspicion on the part of the vulgar minded. We must graft upon this American tree the real, unquestionable buds of royalty. From \$5,000,000 to \$20,000,000 each will buy them. Pay up.

But here is a very lengthy list of items that relate to matters nearer home. In amounts designated, its millions are staggering, but they must be met. In one block down town there are nearly a dozen drygoods stores, each almost an exact duplicate of the others even in detail. Each has its business manager, its departmental heads and clerks, its coterie of delivery rigs or boys. The fact that two or more of these deliveries must often speed to the same home at the same time with various little bundles of an ounce or more in weight, does not, in this system, reduce necessity for their duplication. Each of these establishments must meet its big bills for rent, taxes, license, etc., and, in addition, yield a round profit to the owners. These establishments must all be sustained in order that goods may be retailed—may be passed to a consumer; and the fact that if business organization were substituted for industrial anarchy, it would remove, by elimination of the useless and parasitic, at least three-fourths of this entire expense, cannot be urged. This is the system of doing business; these firms are all engaged in it and must be supported. And the same line of argument holds with equal force for all other lines of retailing, whether it be hardware, medicine, groceries or grog. The system demands it; the items must stand. Pay up.

This partial list suffices to illustrate the nature and something of the extent of the assessments that, in this hypothet-

ical system, it would be necessary to levy upon productive labor. But especial emphasis must here be placed upon the fact that *when these assessment lists had all been compiled and paid, there would still remain in the pocket of the laborer just what he now gets as a wage.* Such a system would not cost him one cent more than does the present system that he thinks is good enough for him; for, as is self-evident, he would, in that system, *pay the identical bills that his labor now pays.*

He works a day and averages to produce what retails at \$10. He is paid a wage that will buy in the markets one-fifth of what he produces, because his subsistence requires that much. He sells his commodity, labor-power, and receives its equivalent in other commodities. There are \$8 worth of his product left, and, certain it is, that \$8 must pay all else that is paid, for, outside of what he, himself, consumes, there is nothing else from which payment can be made.

Again, if the laborer is at all enlightened in economics, he at once discerns that the manner of the exploiters' dividing this \$8 among themselves is not at all a concern of his. He gets out of his labor the cost of reproducing his labor-power. That cost, on the average, determines the market price of his commodity, and more than that cannot average to come to him. The \$8 can no more, in the present system of industry, be his than can the planet Jupiter. Its distribution among those who live upon it is a matter foreign to his interests. What does concern him is, first, that the surplus-product exists and that its sole function is to feed parasites; and, second, what must be done to obviate all necessity for supplying the wants of this industrially useless horde of humanity; or in other words, what is the best method of doing away with the system of industry that exploits labor. Nor in the long run, does the matter of prices

concern him. If they rise or fall the change may temporarily affect him advantageously or otherwise; but a corresponding change must soon occur in his wage, for his fifth he must have and assuredly he will get no more. An arrangement that would deal out to him his actual fifth, instead of the money necessary to buy it, would remove directly his interest in the matter of prices. Then the capitalist class would be left to fight out the matter of dividing the \$8, and the producer of it could view the battle as he might any other passing show. This condition obtains because, as is obvious, he is exploited entirely through production and not through consumption. And HE, let us not forget, means every laborer *necessary*, in any field whatsoever, for the carrying on of industry. The universal test of usefulness for each individual in our industries is, would a thoroughly organized system demand his labor (or that of any other laborer) in the field of his present activity? If so, he is a necessary and consequently a productive laborer.

Let us return to the consideration of our hypothetical plan of paying the productive laborers the full \$10 and then assessing them directly for just what they now pay through indirect methods.

Not a very exalted flight of imagination is required to picture labor's consternation at the first presentation of the itemized levy-lists. There would certainly be a scene that would fill the stage of our nation such as man has never yet witnessed. The capitalist system of exploiting labor, backed as it is by political bosses, organizations and machines; by press, pulpit and university; by legal precedent and talent and the customs and teachings of ages; by armies and navies and all the powers of concentrated wealth, would last about thirty days, would end with the first pay-day. And why? Solely because the injustice, the hideousness of the thing would, at one stroke, be laid bare in such manner as to be

easily discernible even by the most dull of comprehension. Before the blue pencil of the mass of productive laborers were half through with that list, a revolution would be wrought; the capitalist system of industry would terminate and Socialism would be established.

And yet labor today is monthly meeting every requirement of that obnoxious list without an intelligent protest. It stands ready to denounce the "agitator" who so much as proposes its formal discussion as one ambitious only "to make us divide up"; as a breeder of "dissension in our organization"; as a "violator of the principles of law and order"; as "an undesirable citizen." The only inference that can be drawn from such deportment is that labor is not enlightened. But it does not follow that it is incapable of enlightenment, for we have seen how quickly a comprehension of things as they really are could be awakened by letting what is now exploited from its toil once actually come into its possession. A knowledge of actual conditions it is gradually gaining. Once gained, that knowledge is an eternal, soul-inspiring possession, a fountain of faith that scoffs at the tempter—that all the powers of hell cannot shake.

V.

THE CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH

The earth itself, in its natural state, is the original source of the substances out of which all material wealth must spring, the source of all that sustains life, all that makes life possible. On nature's produce ready made, and totally uninfluenced by any act of man, all life for ages subsisted and developed. It was in nature alone that there was de-

veloped, and for tens of thousands of years sustained, a race of beings potentially all that man has since become.

But nature unaided by human ingenuity and skill could not develop the race of today nor sustain it for but a few hours. To develop beyond the lowest stage of savagery, it was necessary for man to discover and turn to his utility one or more of the special properties of matter. He must discover some natural force, and more, he must learn how to accumulate that force and direct it. He learned to throw stones, use fire, make and use the bow-and-arrow, bake pottery, domesticate animals, plant grain, smelt bronze and then iron, build wind-mills and dam rivers, construct steam engines, railways, telegraph lines and dynamos. In other words, he discovered and enslaved the forces of muscular contraction, chemical affinity, gravitation, expanding vapor, and electric attraction and repulsion. With each new discovery, each invention, he but increased his productive power, but found a means for making old earth yield more of life's sustenance and consequently paved the way to a higher and better manhood.

Today our life energy is very largely expended in the application of machinery to natural products. Our machines, factories, oil refineries, steel plants, railroads, etc., are but artificial means for forcing nature to yield or give up more abundantly her life-sustaining things.

It is not because we are civilized that we possess these things. On the contrary, we are civilized because we possess them. The first tribe that used the bow-and-arrow did not possess it because they were conquerors; but they became conquerors because of its possession. Man has advanced just as he has learned to enslave nature's forces, but the advancement followed the enslaving—was a consequence of it.

Each new discovery or invention gave added impetus to

his effort to sustain himself, to get food, clothing and shelter, to accumulate needful things. Each called for an additional vocabulary, new lines of activity and, as a consequence of these, a broadening and deepening of thought. Each supplied the basis for the establishment of a new concept (and a new fact) of relations between men and between tribes or nations, and these new relations rapidly remodeled ideas of what is commonly called right and wrong. When the development of agriculture made a captive neighbor worth more as a slave than as roast meat, the great wrong of roasting him was a very natural deduction. But that conclusion was not drawn from any thing else that man ever did or taught, or from any inspiration ever given him during all the thousands of years of his previous labor, philosophings and forming of ethical codes. When the capitalist system of industry had so far developed that competition among sellers of labor-power made that commodity cheaper than possessing its owner, when wage-labor became a source of greater profit than slave-labor or serf-labor, the conception of the great wrongs of previous systems found easy access into the minds of men. But there was not room in all man's previous moral codes for even one paragraph arguing as right every man's privilege of free contract. When the present capitalist system of exploiting productive labor shall have developed in the minds of that labor a realization of what the thing really is; when toilers shall have learned that "no wage can ever be a just reward for a day's work"; when the fact that "to the producer should belong that which is produced" shall have gained ascendancy; then the relations of men and the modes of conducting affairs that are now sanctioned by custom, precedent, law, moral code and organized force will appear in all their hideousness. A new standard of ethics will be established and the world

will move forward impelled by its own force-enslaving devices.

The one circumstance to which all others are subordinate that will compel the revolutionary movement preliminary to another advance is the rapid and, in this system, necessary concentration of wealth under ownership and sway of a few of our citizens.

The consequences of this condition cannot be overestimated. Our nation's wealth is rapidly flowing to the few and all the restraining forces that capitalism can conjure up are impotent to stop it. A Roosevelt may preach regulation, a Hearst may plead for a revised penal code, preachers may pray for a righteous stewardship, and a Bryan hold seances with the spirits of the past. It matters not. Concentration goes on and would go on even though it were possible (as it is not) to enact all of their demands into law. Concentration is an effect and its cause is too apparent to admit of serious disputation.

Our factories, mines, oil works, steel plants, railroads, etc., are the institutions that make possible our tremendous production, that make possible the sustenance of many, many times the people that this land sustained when the white race first invaded it. These are the mediums through which production is accomplished. These, in the language of the laborer, are the jobs of the nation *and producing humanity can live only by working in these jobs.*

The average production from each job is far in excess of the portion of the product that falls to him who works therein. The surplus-product goes to the job owner. This surplus-product being in present conditions, far in excess of what the job-owner can consume, accumulation must result. And that accumulation must be proportional to the number and productive efficiency of the jobs owned. The job is the medium through which the worker is exploited

and the nation's wealth is drifting into the hands of the exploiters.

Again, the results of this job-exploitation are accumulative. The more jobs a man owns, the more he must continue to acquire; or, in other words, the more of the sources of subsistence a man owns, the more these sources must fall to his ownership—the more he must buy. To illustrate, suppose a man has property that yields an annual income of \$25,000,000. If we reckon this as 10 per cent of its valuation, he owns \$250,000,000 worth of the nation's sources of subsistence. His gain of \$25,000,000 he invests in other of these profit yielding concerns. His ownership is now \$275,000,000 and his next annual gain is \$27,500,000. He again invests and then owns \$302,500,000 of the things in which laborers must work in order to live. His next gain is \$30,250,000 and his consequent ownership after investing is \$332,750,000, and so on year after year.

Is this the way of the business world? Is this what actually takes place? Mr. Andrew Carnegie in *World's Work* for December, 1908, (See also *Literary Digest* December 12, 1908), answers this question. After citing some interesting points in the contrast between the lives of rich and poor, he says:

"It is one of the saddest and most indefensible of all contrasts presented in life; but when we proceed to trace the work of wealth as a whole, it is soon found that even these extravagances absorb but a small fraction of it. (The millionaire's wealth.) The millionaire's funds are all at work; only a small sum lies in bank subject to check. Our railways and steamships, mills and furnaces, industrial structures, and much of the needed working capital to keep them in operation, are the result of invested wealth. The millionaire with two (\$10,000,000), and the new multi-millionaire with twenty millions sterling (\$100,000,000) keep

only trifling sums lying idle. All else they put to work, much of it employing labor. They cannot escape this unless they turn miser and keep the gold to gloat over, which no rich man does whom the writer knows or has heard of. On the contrary, the millionaire as a rule is both mindful and shrewd, more apt than those of smaller fortune to invest his capital carefully."

In the same periodicals above cited, Mr. John D. Rockefeller assures us that the big fortune is kept "universally diffused in the sense that it is kept invested and it passes into the pay envelop week by week."

It passes into the pay envelop and we have already seen something of the augmented form in which it returns, again to go forth for still further augmentation and reinvestment.

This procedure has gone on until today one man, in all probability, owns of our national resources and means of production what it would require at least a billion dollars to buy. His annual returns mount to near the hundred million mark; and these vast sums he uses each year to acquire possession of more of our sources of subsistence, to still further augment his gains and, consequently, the necessity for continuance of his purchases. In his quest for something in which to invest his gains, he has drifted from oil into steel, railways, coal, banking, farm mortgages, skyscrapers, hotels, street car lines, mines of every metal and no telling what else. And he is all powerful in every line.

And here another point is worthy of note. The industrial concerns owned by our few immensely wealthy citizens are those of greatest efficiency—the big concerns with every possible device for multiplying the productivity of labor. For instance, by consulting pages 10 and 11 of Bulletin 57 of the U. S. Census of Manufactures for 1905, we learn that, of the millions of laborers therein considered, 71.6% are employed in but 11.2% of the establishments and produce

79.3% of the entire product. The remaining 28.4% of the laborers, employed in small concerns, produce but 20.7% of the product. In other words, while a laborer in a small concern is producing \$72.88 worth of commodities, his neighbor in a big establishment produces \$110.75 worth. That is, labor in the larger, better equipped concerns is a little more than one-half more productive than that in the small ones. The big industrial institutions are the mediums of greatest surplus-product, the exploiters of greatest efficiency, the channels through which flows the wealth of the nation to the few who own them.

One of our greatest statisticians (Dr. Charles B. Spahr) tells us that already 1% of our people own 55% of our national wealth and that 50% own nothing. Whether these figures be exact or not is of but little moment. We know that during the last sixty years the great machines and factories have been installed, multiplying many times the productiveness of millions of toilers; that during the same period our number of millionaires have multiplied two hundred times; and that the richest now has at least one hundred and forty times the wealth of the richest of six decades ago.* We know that billions in dividends have been flowing and must continue to flow to the few as long as this exploiting system of industry shall exist; and that the annual investment of those billions must put under the sway of the investors the sources of subsistence of our people.

A day's productive labor produces what retails at \$10;

* John Spargo (in "Socialism," page 119) quotes the New York "Sun" as authority for a tabulated statement showing that in 1855 there were but 28 millionaires in the United States. We now have between 5,000 and 6,000. Ten years earlier, in 1845, a pamphlet discussing the rich men of that day, named but seven men as the millionaires of our country; and the richest of these, Stephen Girard, held but \$7,000,000 worth of property—a fortune less than the monthly income of the richest of today.

productive labor gets \$2 for doing the work. Out of the remaining \$8 the possessions of the billionaires are builded—it is the only possible source of their creation.

The slave labor of Rome or the serf labor of mediaeval Europe did not directly make billionaires of masters.* The ancient slave, like the modern wage-worker, had first to produce his own subsistence, had to produce the things necessary for his reproduction and increase in numbers. That part of his product must of necessity go to him. What was left went to the master. The crude methods of industry, the total lack of machinery would leave a surplus of probably a few cents upon which his exploiting owner might fairly thrive; but, evidently the old worker could not become a direct source of great wealth. It required modern skill, modern machinery, modern methods and the modern system of slavery to furnish the requisite for the building of the billionaire. Whether the exploiters of today get \$8 out

* The amassing of tremendous fortunes did its deadly work for old Rome as well as for the other nations that have been but are not. When Rome rotted most rapidly, about 1,800 men practically owned the nation. The sources of these great acquisitions were twofold: the stealing of the public domain under a corrupt patrician rule; and the plundering of foreign provinces at the hands of Roman governors.

When Cæsar was assigned the province of Spain, before leaving Rome he was so set upon by his creditors that his friend, Crassus, the richest man in the city, found it necessary to stand sponsor for him to the extent of \$5,000,000. But when he was ready to leave Spain, his term as governor having expired, though he was pronounced one of the most just and moderate of rulers, Plutarch says: "This conduct made him leave his province with a fair reputation; being rich himself and having enriched his soldiers."

"He hath brought many captives home to Rome
Whose ransom did the general coffers fill."

Probably so, but certainly his own tills were not neglected. Our own millionaires find it good policy to occasionally contribute a moiety of their plunder to "public benefactions."

We must not, however, overlook the indirect manner in which Roman slave labor contributed to this fortune building. These slaves did the work of the nation and thus made possible the vast armies for foreign conquest.

of each \$10, or less, or more, is of minor concern in face of the great fact that out of their share, through its constant investment in our sources of life, they are absorbing our nation's wealth and building fortunes at a rate and of such magnitude as surpasses even the dream of a Midas.

John Stuart Mill reminds us that all of man's inventive genius and all his installation of "labor-saving" devices have not lightened the burden of toil for the worker. How could they lighten it in a system such as has always prevailed? Labor-power is a commodity and in its exchange for other commodities can never realize more than the commodities necessary to be consumed in order to reproduce that labor-power. If labor can produce the requisite commodities in two hours, then it gets the returns from two hours' labor, and its exploiters get the rest. If by aid of machinery and generally improved means of production, labor could produce the equivalent of its commodity—could produce its subsistence—in half an hour, it would get the product of half an hour and no more. If it took the old slave nine hours of each ten to produce his kind, nine-tenths of his labor-product had to go to him in order that he live and produce more slaves; then there was left for the master but one-tenth of the results of relatively very inefficient labor. That is why the old master could not build billions by simply exploiting the slave; and, likewise, that is why the contemporaries of George Washington could not do so in their day from the wage-labor of the colonists. But today the machine is at work; the productiveness of labor is multiplied beyond the wildest imaginings of our ancestors and the possessions of the few are augmented in like degree. The nation goes to the few as naturally as water seeks its level.

Thomas W. Lawson has told us that it is a mere matter of arithmetic to compute the time when a dozen men will own all of this nation that is worth owning. That does not

mean, neighbor, that this dozen will own your little store or business or industry. No, if those fellows ever want to own a store in your little burg, they will have no use for yours, nor will you have any use for it either. He means that they will own the sources of subsistence of the nation, the great mediums through which labor is exploited, all the things such as they now own, and from whose returns they are so rapidly absorbing the little that is left.

We are now ready to consider the nature of the fight between the "big capitalists" and the "little ones." There are two parts to labor's product. First, the part that goes to labor and is consumed by labor. This, of course, the exploiters cannot have; that is, they must pay a wage that will purchase labor's part in the market. We have assumed it to be \$2 (or \$2 worth of commodities). Second, the part that goes to the exploiters and that we call \$8 (or \$8 worth of commodities). This is the exploiters' exclusive share—the part for which they have to render no equivalent to any one. As long as laborers must sell their labor-power as a commodity—as long as the labor-exploiting system is in vogue—it is evident that none of the \$8 worth can ever go to labor. But it must be observed that the \$8 worth is all that can go to the exploiters however numerous they may be. They must all live from it as there is nothing else upon which they could live. Then it logically follows that the less of them there are, or the more of them that are removed from necessity of sharing that \$8 worth, the more there is left for those remaining.

Those that are driven from among the exploiters—eliminated by the concentrating processes of production and exchange—must of necessity join the ranks of the workers. This tens of thousands have already learned from experience who were once independent producers, owning the tools with which they worked, or employers of at most a few

hand-workers or workers with small machines, and with whom the employer labored side by side. They (or their descendants) are now among the army of employed in the great factories, or the other army upon the highway. "But theirs is another story" that will be told in its proper sequence.

"But," says one who has not fully thought out this matter, "the merchant is one of the exploiters and a large part of his profits are derived from sale of goods to laborers. Does not he get a large share of the laborer's \$2 worth? Does not the laborer buy of him and he make profit on what he sells? How does the \$8 worth support him?"

Here is wherein many are deceived by appearances. The author has heard many men, otherwise well informed, assert that the labor unions should center their fight against the all too numerous merchants who, through necessity for high profits, rob laborers of their earnings—"they should fight those who take their money, not those who pay it to them."

Such argument comes from persons whose observations have penetrated far enough into the capitalist system of industry to learn that the great mass of duplicated institutions called stores represents a tremendous waste; and they imagine that if the major portion of these things could be done away with, prices of living could be greatly reduced and consequently labor's wages would buy much more than now. In other words, such a reform would raise the actual wage—purchasing power—though the nominal wage remained unchanged. But no such condition could obtain. These persons have never thought of labor-power in its true light, as merely a commodity, or they would know that if the prices of all other commodities were to fall from the removal of a lot of useless stores or from any other cause, the price of the commodity labor-power must also fall in

like degree. They have never conceived the fact that it is a certain part of labor's product that must go to the laborer, and if he can buy that part—his subsistence—for 25 cents per day, that 25 cents will determine his wage. They do not observe this fact although evidence of it is world wide in the ratio of prices and wages in every land.

Granting our assumed value of a day's product, \$10 worth (or for that matter any other amount) then it is evident that both the laborer and the merchant must subsist upon that product. If the laborer consumes but one-fifth of it, he is exploited out of four-fifths and no more. If the laborer (as he must) consumes his fifth, certainly the merchant cannot also consume it or any part of it. Then the part he consumes must be of the \$8 worth or nothing, for there is nothing else for him to consume.

As previously suggested, if the laborer were given his fifth of the product instead of being given money enough to buy it, and the other four-fifths were divided among the exploiters just as it now is, each would receive just what he now enjoys and certainly no one would then accuse the merchant or anyone else of exploiting the laborer through any process except production. The merchant is simply a medium through which the laborer's fifth reaches him. The capitalist, instead of giving the laborer his share by direct process, simplifies matters by giving him money sufficient to go and get it of the merchant; and at the same time he makes of the laborer a medium through whom the merchant's share—that is, sufficient money to buy his share—reaches the merchant. The arrangement is very convenient and is distinguished from that that would obtain if Socialists had their way chiefly in these particulars. first, the merchant would not be a profit-monger but would be simply a necessary laborer; second, the number of such concerns

would be probably a twentieth of what it now is and the expense of their maintenance reduced proportionately.

The fight of the laborer then, in the capitalist system, is to maintain his standard of subsistence and to raise it if possible—to get more of what he produces—and, when he is more fully enlightened, will be for the entire removal of the exploiter as such from the industrial field. The fight of the capitalist, so far as it engages the laborer, is to reduce this standard of labor's subsistence, or at least, to prevent its being augmented. But the discussion of this matter does not logically enter here. This contention between producers and exploiters is the great (economic) class struggle whose suggestion is so distasteful to such as Messrs. Rockefeller, Morgan, Carnegie and Roosevelt.

We are here to consider the contention of the exploiters among themselves over the distribution of the \$8 worth that labor produces for them. We have already seen something of the tremendous fraction of the nation's sources of subsistence that has already passed into the possession of a few, and that such accumulation is possible solely because of the efficiency of modern methods of production.

Possible possession of that \$8 worth that labor now provides for the exploiters is a very potent incentive to action upon their part; and it is that possession that supplies the requisite for effective action. Each of them is striving against all the others for the coveted prize. The "big capitalists" want as nearly all of it as possible. They have no interest in, and they have a very decided and natural aversion to dividing it with a lot of unnecessary "small fry." Its possession they can secure just to the extent that they acquire ownership of the sources of our subsistence—the exploiting mediums, the instruments of production. These they must control and through that control gain a proportionate share of that \$8 worth.

Our system of industry makes possible this acquisition by the capitalist because it grants him the right of private property in our essentials to life. In fact the chief function of all our governmental institutions is to maintain that right as one of greater sanctity even than the right to life itself.

And what is this "property right" that our governmental forces are organized to defend? We ordinarily think of a property as consisting of earth, wood, brick, stone or steel or a combination of these. But it is not the right to these that requires such an array of forces. Far from it. These are but a means to an end. It is the end to be accomplished through their possession that needs guarding. For instance, suppose a Harriman should tender John Doe as a gift the absolute ownership of any part of, or for that matter, all of the railways of this nation, on condition that said Doe shall operate them at the cost of that operation. Doe may keep them in the best possible condition, extend them whenever and wherever necessary and make of them the greatest and best transporting medium of the earth; but he must not use them to exploit labor. What has the said Harriman prof-fered the said Doe? Truly a wonderful mass of finely con-structed earth, wood, stone and steel; but what is the thing worth to Doe? Less than nothing, for there has been con-ferred upon Doe a big job that would not provide him bread and water. What has Harriman barred in that gift? The property right so sacred to capitalism; the right to use that mass of essential things to exploit humanity—to turn the toil and sweat of millions into a private bank account and through its reinvestment gain possession of still other things in which the producer must work or cease to be; the right to own the sources of life of the nation as rapidly as millions in annual dividends can acquire them. It is this right and this alone that makes that mighty mass of material

"a property." And it is the operating of industry with this end in view that concentrates wealth.

Among capitalists the \$8 worth is the bone of contention. The big fellows—those backed by mighty possessions and millions in annual dividends—want it all. As the fraction of it that goes to them increases (as they get possession of the nation's resources) the smaller capitalists are necessarily crowded off the field—starved out. To this very naturally the smaller holders of wealth object; against this they array their forces. They are fighting to retain a position among the exploiters, fighting to evade the fate of the laborer.

It is this struggle among the capitalists themselves over the division of the \$8 worth that furnishes the material for the maintenance of at least two and often more political parties. It is to the various points of contention as to what should constitute a proper division that the various planks in their platforms relate. They prate of extravagances in expenditure of public funds, of "square deals," of corrupt bossism, of incompetencies, of the sacredness of property, of combines, trusts and pools, of excessive capitalization, of excessive transportation rates, of rebates, of the domination by corporations, of the destruction of competition, of the physical valuation of railways, of return to the principles enunciated by our fathers, of the depredations of the predatory rich, of the relative merits of various scales or systems of taxation.

A careful perusal of the planks in the various platforms issued by their conventions fails to reveal anything of real merit, or that savors of seriousness or honesty, that relates in any way to anything but, as has been said, contention over matters relating solely to the distribution of that \$8 worth of labor's product among the capitalists themselves. And

herein is included every party that advocates the capitalist system of industry, the present, labor-exploiting system—every party except a strictly Socialist party.

How, then, can an intelligent laboring man center interest in that fight? Labor produces \$10 worth—\$2 worth and \$8 worth. The \$2 worth goes to a laborer and is consumed by him, and it is all that he can ever consume in the capitalist system of industry. The \$8 worth is taken from his product for consumption by the exploiters, the capitalists. They quarrel over the manner of its distributing, and immediately the laborers form into two or more lines, swing into columns, march like veterans, shout like charging heroes and vote like patriots in effort to aid exploiters in their distribution of what has been so systematically filched from these same laborers. If a man were waylaid and robbed and the robbers were to get into a fight over the division of the spoils, it would certainly be an anomalous circumstance to witness his seizing a club and entering that contest to aid in fair or unfair distribution of that loot. Yet is that not in miniature what, in effect, is constantly witnessed in every land where labor is enfranchised? True the \$8 worth is extracted through due process of law, through the regular workings of the capitalist system of industry, through a process more subtle and refined than any ever known to alembic art; but it is just as surely taken from the laborer as if filched by highwaymen and, barring the possible consequences of violence, is he not equally a loser, equally robbed? What matters it to the millions of producers whether that \$8 worth (which can never come to them) goes to five big capitalists or ten half-grown ones, as long as, in either contingency, there is for them but subsistence for ten hours' toil?

To summarize, the use of machinery in modern industry

has multiplied the productiveness of labor by tens, by hundreds, by thousands as compared with that of any former period of history. As in any other period labor receives, as reward for its toil, subsistence—enough to reproduce its kind. The standard of subsistence varies somewhat in different places and countries but, in general, it is such as is necessary to qualify laborers for the work required of them. This increased productiveness of labor leaves a vast surplus for the use of the exploiters. Out of this surplus the great factories and all the gigantic productive enginery of today are constructed. These require a division of labor and a simplifying of its processes to the ultimate. Production is thus concentrated—socialized—and the ownership of its instruments, through necessity for annual investment of gains, passes inevitably into ever fewer hands.

The concentration of wealth-possession, then, is due solely to two circumstances, two causes: first, increased productivity of labor; second, private or individual ownership of the sources of subsistence with its necessary concomitant, the exploitation of labor—the operation of industry for profit.

Since there are but two causes for this concentration (this effect), it follows that there are but two methods for preventing it. First, decrease the productivity of labor. This could be accomplished by destroying machinery and prohibiting its use in industry. We are told that this is the course pursued by the Chinese ages ago; and to that policy they still adhere, except when dissuaded by the arguments of the enginery of modern (and foreign) warfare. Second, we must abolish the right of private ownership in our resources—in the instruments of production—in the things used collectively in industry. Or, in other words, we must abolish the right to exploit the productive labor of the nation. Private ownership, as has previously been shown, without exploita-

tion, without profit, is a self-evident absurdity—an impossibility.

Of the first, or Chinese solution of this problem, a reversion to the cart, the stage-coach and the making of commodities by hand—the destruction of machinery—little need be said. It is too palpably absurd to merit serious consideration. And yet it differs only in degree from what is advocated by a so-called democracy or other capitalistic “enemies of the trusts” who, at least pretentiously, seek to destroy the greatest and most thoroughly organized and equipped productive institutions that civilization has yet produced, for the purpose of establishing in their stead a greater number of small concerns, in an effort to revert to obsolete competitive methods. But the world has outgrown adherence to all such doctrines. Retrogression is impossible. The contention that any sort of labor-saving device, whether it be “trust” or steam engine, should be replaced by any number of smaller institutions or machines for the sole purpose of giving men jobs regardless of the waste of energy thereby entailed, is out of all consonance with the spirit of progress. It will never attract the serious and enlightened attention of our race, to say nothing of the evident impossibility of accomplishing such results through a capitalistic party while wealth concentrations exist and exert their natural sway over the conduct of men.

The economic devices are with us and to stay. They constitute a very essential element in that very complex compound called civilization. They are the means for producing things with the least expenditure of time and energy; and they are that which makes human progress or man’s higher development possible and imperative. The age of machinery is just ushering in. Without any claim to prophetic vision it may be said that, in great measure, the machine age is yet

in its swaddling clothes. To grow to vastly greater fullness, it is not necessary that new forces be enslaved, but that we keep on devising better means for accumulating and directing those already captive. We will make these forces perform the drudgery of earth and give the world time and opportunity to develop a manhood and womanhood that is not characterized by "smart sets" and slums, by excessive riches and excessive wretchedness, by princes and paupers, masters and slaves, and an organized system of corruption that taints every trace of authority, that may well be the envy of the powers of hell.

Evidently, then, the only solution for the problem of the concentration of wealth-ownership involves solely the question of our vestment of ownership in the sources of our material welfare. While these are the exclusive preserves of individuals, while they are privately owned and operated as *they must be in private ownership* for the enhancement of the wealth and power of the owners, they are of necessity the source of private wealth-concentration. While privately owned, they must be used to exploit producing humanity; they must, in capitalism, be used as a means for producing surplus-product and that surplus, in turn, for propagation of its kind. In profit, in exploitation, lies the sole sustaining force of capitalism.

The remedy lies in the substitution of collective ownership of our national resources for the present system of private ownership—in their collective possession and in their operation for the purpose of supplying the needs of all, instead of for enhancement of the possessions of a few of our citizens or of foreign investors.

This is a fundamental tenet of Socialism and any declaration of principles or demands that omits or evades it is foreign to Socialists. They make this demand because they

realize that concentration of wealth-ownership and its inevitable consequences are rapidly undermining the very foundations of our political and social structures. This concentration must cease; and that cannot be while these things are private preserves. They make this demand because they would stop the tyrannical and unjust expropriation of the products of toil; because they hold that, in simple justice, a producer is entitled to the full social equivalent of his labor.

The term "social equivalent" as here used is what Socialists mean when they speak of the producer's getting "the full product of his labor." It does not mean that if a laborer in a shop can make a dozen chairs a day, he shall receive as his reward a dozen chairs that he does not want, or a dozen other things made by one other laborer in the same time that he does want. The laborer in the shop is only one requisite to the making of chairs. The shop and machinery must be constructed, the raw material gotten out, the finished product transported and handled through some medium whereby it can most conveniently be reached by a consumer—some species of retail establishment; an educational system must be maintained, hospitals and all necessary public institutions must be supported; public improvements must be made, in short, all needful labor must be carried on in order that chairs be produced in a manner that is in keeping with our civilization. And all the labor in the industries plus all the labor necessary to carrying on the industries—necessary to making the industries possible—but which cannot directly manufacture things, together constitute the labor socially necessary to production. Our laborer might get for his own consumption (or use) the absolute equivalent of eight chairs, that is, as much of other commodities as eight hours' labor will produce, and still get "the full product of his labor"—its full social equivalent.

"But," says some thoughtless Thomas, "what an endless system of reckoning all this entails? How could his just share be computed? Who would attempt such a task?" Well, who does it now? Or are you so benighted as to assume that a similar result is not now arrived at? What now determines what a laborer shall or must receive for his effort and what part of labor's product shall be bestowed here and there wherever it is bestowed? "Nobody," you answer, "Like Topsy, it just grew." There is more truth than humor in your answer, but it is not all truth. If such a balancing of things as now obtains, just or unjust, could "grow" out of such a system of industrial anarchy as capitalism presents, do you think that a thorough organization, systematization of industry would render any sort of method of distribution a very difficult task? Not one whit more difficult than is the estimating and levying of taxes to run your city or county. No, your answer is not all truth. The matter of adjusting that \$2 worth that goes to labor and of distributing the \$8 worth that does not go to him, furnishes the problems of the business as well as of the political world. But never is the problem one involving a question of equity or justice between man and man. It is, how can we get more and allow the other fellows less, or keep a firm hold on what we have already secured and the advantages already gained?—problems that could in no way enter into a Socialist regime.

Again says another: "Are you not assuming when you contend that there is but the one given method for remedying this great evil? Cannot we, by legal process, stop this career of the 'predatory rich' and secure a more equitable distribution of labor's product?" The question is pertinent and merits consideration.

Can we not enact that more of labor's product shall go

to the needful laborers? Can we not by law raise wages, or, what would in effect be the same thing, lower prices and maintain them at the lower figure? Evidently it would be necessary to legislate on both wages and prices of all commodities; for if we forced a higher wage without the price-governing enactment, our effort would at once be neutralized by an advance of the price of labor's subsistence. The absurdity of such procedure is self-apparent. At the very outset we "have an elephant on our hands" of which we would gladly rid ourselves.

"But New Zealand enacts what shall constitute the minimum wage." Yes, and that minimum fixes the standard of subsistence for all unskilled labor at just its figure; and through unskilled labor it likewise fixes the standard in all industries in the necessary proportions. New Zealand is a small country and not yet blessed with a few millionaires in industry to monopolize the exploitation of labor. One Rockefeller in such a country would absorb everything subject to absorption in about a month. The best features of the New Zealand laws are, first, they make strikes practically impossible; second, they make it compulsory on the part of the government to furnish some sort of employment to every citizen in need of it.

Suppose a law were enacted in this country raising wages and another as its necessary accompaniment fixing a maximum of prices so that the first law would be really effective. This would lower the capitalist's possible gains from industry and leave "the fittest to survive." Would the fittest be the great concerns or the smaller ones? The survivors would of course be those that can produce most cheaply, those most thoroughly organized and equipped—those that constitute the great trusts. The smaller concerns would be at once legislated off the field, unless it were the few that

are of sufficient proportions to be taken under the protecting wing of our industrial kings. Would the trusts be destroyed? Would concentration of wealth cease from thus concentrating even a reduced rate (but not necessarily a reduced total) of dividends as the share of the few? And what has become of the whole system of free contract, and competition, and the right to do as one wills with his own? And, finally, what is the prospect or possibility of a dominant capitalist party's ever attempting such a line of action and how long would it remain dominant if it did so? Serious consideration of all such schemes is the veriest nonsense. As long as capitalism exists, labor will continue to subsist upon that portion of its product that is necessary to reproduce labor-power and wealth will concentrate as a consequence of the surplus produced.

Even the most radical of mere reformers and the most bitter denouncers of the "predatory rich" prate of good trusts and bad ones; nor do any of these tinkerers of the capitalist system, for one moment, contemplate seriously the destruction of the trusts any more than they think of destroying the steam engine. The trust is now as much a fixture as any other device based upon necessity for economy in production. It is the great wealth-concentrating medium and the remedy for its attendant and resultant evils is its collective ownership.

VI.

CORRUPTION.

The one subject of a public nature with which the American people are most familiar is doubtless the matter

of corruption in official and business life. For some years this has been the favorite theme of contributors to periodicals of every sort. Our papers and magazines have been literally saturated with its narrations, and the end is not yet. Every crime listed in our codes and some that the listers overlooked or knew not of have been charged directly against individuals holding positions of public and of private trust. The "muck raker" has been unsparing in his attacks and no sanctum has been too sacred for his invasion. The bank, the corporation's chief place of business, the headquarters and the chief functionaries therein of political parties, election booths, police stations, the city's council chamber, the state capitol, the legislative hall, the House of Representatives, the Senate, all have been paraded before the footlights in our national vaudeville of scandal. Yet despite all the personal attacks and accusations of criminal, or at least compromising relations, accusations that if not sustainable by competent evidence constitute about every possible degree of criminal libel; despite the fact that many of these charges were made directly against men of great wealth and men in high places, not a single "muck raker" nor his publisher was ever brought into court, as a result of his exposures, even to defend a civil action. Some cases were filed and some threatened, but they were soon withdrawn or failed entirely to materialize. Investigating committees were appointed by various bodies authorized to do so, and in every instance their reports revealed even worse conditions than were claimed to exist by those making the exposures. This was notably true in the matters relating to management of insurance and the illegal combines of owners of coal mines and railways. Upton Sinclair, David Graham Phillips, Charles Edward Russell, Thomas W. Lawson and others, in their narrations from actual life, have

made heads to bow in shame, eyes to flash and jaws to snap in anger, words to flow in denunciation or in explanations that did not explain, yet the anomalous circumstance remains that neither the accuser nor the accused has been held to answer in any court either civil or criminal for any statement made or injury inflicted. There seemed to be no desire on the part of the accused to have the facts relative to his doings related in a court of record; and yet, in face of a train of corrupt practices and graft whose exposure forced insurance kings to abdicate without a struggle, we are told by the public prosecutor of the greatest city in our land that so skillfully have the thieveries been planned and executed that no form of indictment against any one of them would stand judicial scrutiny.

A history of the corrupt practices that have been unearthed in connection with the governments of our municipalities would fill volumes. First one city and then another is brought into the lime-light until the daily chronicle of official venality has ceased to excite even curiosity.

As an instance, the Literary Digest (Jan. 9, 1909), tells us that a detective informs Mayor Guthrie, of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, "that there were only six incorruptible men in the City Council—the rest being 'for sale at prices ranging from \$5 upward.'" "Terrifying," declares the Mayor, "is the extent to which graft and insidious corruption of all sorts have undermined the government of our great cities—a process which if not checked 'will spread from cities to the states and thence to the nation, and the *peril of the future* will be not of violence from without, but of corruption from within.'"

The Mayor's vision, or at least his expression of it, is certainly limited. Legislatures are bought and sold, both before and after their convening, with as extreme non-

chance as were ever city councils; nor is it necessary to travel far from Pennsylvania to gain that knowledge from original sources. And what shall we say of his reference to all this, in view of the history of our nation for the last two decades, as "the peril of the future"? Shall we call it human blindness? Or is it optimism ossified?

Franklin P. Gowan, president of the Pennsylvania & Reading railway, said to the committee on commerce of our national House of Representatives: "I have heard the counsel of the Pennsylvania railway, standing in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, threaten that court with the displeasure of his clients if it decided against them."

An author of law text books, J. D. Lawson, warns students, "so far as the law of carriers is concerned pay little heed to the decisions of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania railway appears to run that tribunal with about the same success that it does its own trains."

And yet this Mayor gets excited over the sale of some Pittsburg councilmen—some ward heelers and political thugs such as her franchise grabbers and "eminently respectable citizens" place in authority when something worth owning is in sight or when their already acquired special privileges may need protection by "the strong arm of the law"—and discovers in it a condition that may spread to the states and become a "peril of the future." That man would have to be aboard the cart for the guillotine before he could be brought to realize that the French had revolted.

But Pennsylvania is not a marked exception. Recently a president of a western railway said to Professor Frank Parsons: "We've got to control the legislatures or they will control us. Rates, service, investment, capitalization, terminal facilities, labor conditions, combination—everything in fact about the railway business is subject to the legisla-

tive pull. If we control the legislature the pull is our way; if not, it is likely to be the other way. In any session of congress or the legislature of any state in which our lines are located, a bill may be introduced that threatens our business in some way. It may be a bill in the interests of a rival system, giving them an advantage that will mean great gain for them and great loss perhaps for us. Or it may be a bill to fix rates, or subject us to inconvenience, surveillance, or abolish grade crossings, or compel us to put in automatic appliances, couplers, switches, etc., or some other scheme that will cost us a lot of money. Or the bill may be simply some ——— grafter's bid for blackmail under cover of an apparent public purpose, introduced by some scamp member on purpose to be bought off. We've got to be ready to defend ourselves along the whole line. We must be able to stop adverse bills and put our own bills through. And to do this at reasonable cost is often very difficult, for the ——— grafters have got so used to lumps of railroad money that they won't vote for a railroad bill without the dough, even when we show them that the act is in perfect harmony with the public interests."*

It requires but little insight on the part of an American citizen to discern that this all-pervading corruption, like a great ulcer, is sapping the vital forces of this nation at every pore, just as it drained the life out of the nations of the past. The condition is chronic and so familiar have our people grown to look upon the loathsome affection, so often have they witnessed but a temporary and local stay of its ravages by application of the most potent remedies that capitalism can prescribe, that serious consideration of actually curing the thing is treated by adherents of the present system of

* Parsons: "The Railways, the Trusts and the People," page 95.

industry as a joke. They have lost faith in parties and in men; and as they know of no manner of dealing with the evil except electing men to office to carry on the old routine, to them the case is indeed hopeless. Nor is it any wonder that it is so.

A vast majority of our people frankly admit that corruption, like the concentration of the ownership of wealth, must in some way be stopped; but they are like the people of the northern states before the rebellion—willing to do anything to cure the evil of chattel slavery except what would cure it. The few who advocated the one and only remedy were very undesirable citizens.

Go to any one of the numerous cities whose officials have been so unfortunate as to get caught in their deviltry (and that is wherein they are unlike many other cities of their class) and what do we find underlying their every criminal act? First, the power to grant immunity from prosecution to violators of the law. Second, the power to grant contracts. Third, the power to grant franchises.

The granting of immunity from prosecution to law-breakers is almost as common as policemen. Thousands of instances of this species of corruption could be cited at any time if those who know would but speak. It is a rare circumstance in any city when drinking dives, gambling hells, robbers' nests and houses of assignation and prostitution are not regularly contributing "hush money" to officials whose sworn duty it is to suppress them. But "hush money" is but one avenue of escape—the course usually taken by the law breakers who occupy the lower strata of society. In some cities, notably Los Angeles, it now appears that many disreputable places are a source of revenue for a goodly number of the rich who own stock in a certain sugar company in which those in authority are also interested. It

seems a case of "what is the constitution between friends?"

Many contracts that those in authority must grant, if skilfully manipulated in the granting, are a source of great profit—and graft. There is "thousands in them" and a reasonable "divide" is quite commonly regarded as the proper thing. This species of corruption is all-pervading from the smaller cities to the national government itself. The appointment of a committee by our national officers or congress to investigate corrupt dealings in the management of our postal service is not uncommon, and their reports have involved officials of high rank as participants in shameless frauds. In every instance, the evil doing had its roots in the letting of a contract. Both corrupter and corrupted seemed to act upon the theory that "the public treasury is primarily for private loot"; and the mere giving or taking of a bribe is a small matter when there is "something in it" for all concerned. Pittsburg's recent unearthing of a series of briberies to get the city's money deposited in certain banks is the latest fully developed variety of the contract species of corruption. The banks wanted that money to loan and were willing to pay in advance a part of the gains that would certainly fall to them through securing the deposits.

The most usual and conspicuous cases of corruption in our municipal, state and national affairs are in connection with the granting of franchises. Their conspicuity is due to the wealth of the corrupter, the magnitude of the sums disbursed and the number and rank of officials involved. Hundreds of thousands in cold cash are the entry fees in this game where there are millions in sight for the winner. St. Louis, San Francisco and some other "unfortunates" attest this fact. Charles Edward Russell, in "At the Throat of the Republic," tells us that nearly a million of dollars was spent in one election in New York city in order to

secure control of a board of aldermen; but when we learn that those same aldermen would have, as part only of their duties, the sole disposition of franchises worth ten times the amount spent to secure them, the donations are nowise disproportionate.

The foregoing discussion, though a mere outline, suffices to indicate the sources of corruption and, likewise, the ambitions that perpetuate it. In every instance it is to the bribed the payment directly of money or indirectly of some lucrative position, for the sole purpose, on the part of the briber, of acquiring possession of some source of gain. Now, in what lies this power to pay; and what makes possible the gainful institutions for whose possession so many stand ready to sacrifice honor and risk liberty and disgrace? What is the source of gain to both briber and bribed? It must lie in the products of labor, for the gain is some form of material wealth or some means for its acquisition, and certain it is, these must originate in productive labor only.

This leads us directly to our divided labor product. The gain, whether corruption fund or the resulting acquisition of the corrupter, can be no part of the \$2 worth consumed by labor. Then it follows that both corruption fund and all that is acquired by or through it must draw its entire sustenance from the \$8 worth that is exploited through this capitalist system of industry from the products of toil. This is the sole source; no other is possible.

We have already seen something of the struggle among capitalists for possession of the nation's sources of subsistence, the labor-exploiting mediums, the things through whose ownership possession of the \$8 worth is secured. Corruption but reveals one phase of this struggle. A contract grants a special opportunity for exploitation for a relatively short time. A franchise is a special privilege to

plant an exploiting medium to operate for a number of years or indefinitely. In cities these are very valuable properties, that is, great sources of profit, efficient means not only for the creation of the \$8 worth but for pocketing a goodly share of it. To gain these contracts or franchises, more especially the latter, the bribers and corrupters (business representatives of the respectable rich) will debauch election officials and electors and blaze a course through a line of "public servants" to the last one in authority.

A peculiar instance illustrative of a shadowy glimpse at the source and significance of this corruption fund came under the author's observation recently. Meeting some laborers who had long worked in San Francisco, the subject of her very protracted and extensive official filth and its exposures was very naturally broached. Noting an apparent indifference on their part as to the outcome of the prosecutions then in full sway, inquiry was made as to the cause of their attitude in the matter. "Why," they said, "should we worry ourselves about such things? Those corruptionists never stole anything from us. They made the capitalists divvy and then divided the loot. The city is rotten to the core, but it is all a squabble among the capitalists." "Yes," I replied, "you got your two dollars out of your labor; you are indifferent as to what became of the other eight." "What eight?" "The eight that the capitalists extracted from your labor's products and that you say they were squabbling over." They looked at each other, then at me and one remarked, "You must be one of them Socialists." In their ignorance they recognized that there was in that city a tremendous fund in which they could never share, that neither increased nor diminished their "pay"; but the thought that it must have its origin in the labor-product of the nation, they had never entertained, any more than the

thought that it had sprung spontaneously from the earth and alighted in the lap of its present possessors.

We found in the private ownership of the nation's means of subsistence the source of the evil of concentrating wealth as the possession of a few. The great struggle of the capitalists is to secure this ownership and through it amass the products of labor. We found the remedy in the collective ownership and operation of these things, thus eliminating the possibility of exploiting labor. Grant this collective ownership and democratic management and no official is then empowered to bestow contracts and franchises. The delegated authority, the corruption fund and the exploiting medium for whose ownership officialdom is corrupted alike are gone. Who then would corrupt officials and for what purpose? But while private ownership—the capitalist system of industry—is in vogue, so will be corruption; while special privileges and franchises are for sale, so will be officials. With our present tremendous means for producing wealth, under individual ownership concentration of fortunes and corruption are concomitants. The cause of the one is identical with that of the other; therefore, identity of remedy is self-evident.

But there are other forms or modes of corruption than those that predominate in our cities—forms far more menacing to our institutions, to our national life, than any yet considered. In these cases the work of the corrupter is more difficult of exposure in its real hideousness; or, to state the facts as they are, since the corrupter does his work wholly within the bounds of law, he is usually indifferent as to the matter of being exposed. In fact, in some instances, exposure redounds to his advantage through revelation of his power to control the conduct of men and the necessity for obedience of his mandates. A single instance will suffice

for illustration of one such mode of corruption fully developed. The channels through which this corrupting influence exerts itself are the venal advocate, the political machine and the capitalist-owned or subsidized press.

As we must here resort to the Congressional Record for evidence, a few preliminary words of explanation are necessary.

Our government hires the railway companies to carry the mail. It pays these companies so much per pound for all mail carried and, in addition, it pays rental for the cars in which the carrying is done. This double system of charging is in itself peculiar. It is as if a business firm hiring cars for the purpose of shipping goods were to be charged, in addition to the car rate, so much per pound for what was put in them.

An express company also hires the railway companies to carry goods consigned to it for transportation and is furnished special cars just as is the government. Its common form of payment is a percentage of the express companies' receipts, but there is no car rental in the consideration.

This letting of contracts to the railway companies by our government officials has long been a fruitful field for corruption—a direct means of payment for political favors out of the public treasury. Some estimation of the expense to the public of such payment may be gleaned from the following figures carefully compiled by Professor Parsons. It is a comparison of what different persons or organizations pay the railway companies for carrying 100,000,000 tons one mile or one ton 100,000,000 miles:

At average railway express rates would cost about	\$5,000,000
At average excess baggage rates would cost about	6,000,000
At average freight rates would cost.....	800,000
At actual mail rates (1898).....	34,754,000

In addition to this we pay as car rental an average of \$6,250 per year per car for cars whose construction costs but from \$2,500 to \$5,000 each. In other words, we pay as rental from 3.42 cents to 6.85 cents per mile per car. The beef trust charges $\frac{3}{4}$ of one cent per mile for its cars and still reaps rich harvests from its enterprise.*

This looting of our public funds for the benefit of corporations has been at various times brought vividly to the attention of our congress, but to no other purpose than to continue it or actually increase its volume from year to year. For instance, on May 12, 1908, a bill was before the United States Senate carrying among other things an appropriation of \$4,600,000 "for railway post-office car service," or in other words, for car rentals. To this bill Senator Thomas P. Gore of Oklahoma offered some amendments. In order to eliminate all questions of authenticity or veracity concerning this matter, the following is the verbatim record of the proceedings in the Senate in relation thereto as found on pages 6396 and 6397 of the Congressional Record, under date of May 12, 1908:

"Mr. Gore. I desire to submit an amendment. On page 22, after line 18, I move to insert the following proviso:

"Provided, That the Postmaster-General shall not pay more for the transportation of mails than express companies pay for the transportation of express of similar weight and character.

"The Vice-President. The question is on the agreement to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

"Mr. Gore. Mr. President, I will state the reason why I offer the amendment. In a great many countries in the

* Parsons: "The Railways, the Trusts and the People," pages 146 and 148.

world the railway companies carry the mails free of charge. That is true in France, I understand, except where the cars belong to the Government, in which case a nominal charge is paid amounting to one cent per car mile. In Austria-Hungary and in Germany one car per train is carried free of charge on other than Government railroads. In Italy and in Belgium the mails are carried free of charge, as I am informed.

"Now, it is not my purpose or the purpose of any one to ask the railroads of this country to transport mails free of charge; but, sir, the charges received by the railroads paid by the Government are far in excess of that which is reasonable and just.

"I will cite a few discriminations based upon estimates rendered a few years ago. The charges from New York to Boston on first-class freight matter was 38 cents a hundred; on express it was 50 cents a hundred, and on mail it was 89 cents a hundred. From New York to Atlanta, Ga., the first-class freight charge was \$1.26 a hundred; the express charge was \$2 a hundred, and the mail charge was \$3.50 a hundred. From New York to Chicago the charge was 75 cents a hundred for first-class freight, \$1.25 for express, and \$3.56 for mail. The charge from New York to San Francisco at the same time was \$3 a hundred for first-class freight, \$6.75 for express, and \$13.28 for the mails.

"Now, sir, there is no justice and no justification in discriminations of that character, and I therefore move to limit the charge for mail to the charges paid by the express companies to the railroads for similar services.

"In the Dominion of Canada mail is classified as freight of the lowest classification and bears the lowest rate. This amendment carries no proposition of that sort, but it seeks to protect the Government against charges which are un-

reasonable and unjust. If there is any justification for paying so much greater charges for postage than for express, I would like see some Senator justify it."

"Mr. Penrose. Mr. President, the conditions are so absolutely dissimilar between the character of express and mail matter that I trust the Senate will not agree to the amendment."

"The amendment was rejected.

"Mr. Gore. On page 23 I move to strike out lines 13 and 14 in the following words: 'For railway post-office car service, \$4,600,000.'

"The Vice-President. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

"Mr. Gore. I move to strike out these lines because, as I have suggested, we pay very much more for carrying the mails than is paid for either freight or express matter, and in addition to that we pay an excessive charge for rental of the cars in many instances. I therefore move to strike out these lines.

"The amendment was rejected.

"Mr. Gore. At the end of line 14 on page 23 I move to insert:

"That the Postmaster-General shall not pay more annual rental for the postal cars than 33 1-3 per cent of the cost of the car."

"The Vice-President. The question is on agreement to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was rejected.

"Mr. Gore. I move to insert after line 14 on page 23:

"That the Postmaster-General shall not pay more annual rental for postal cars than the cars cost."

"I submit that the government has paid at times practically three times as much annual rental for postal cars as the

cars cost. Now, that is a self-evident injustice and extortion. Possibly no Senator will say that these cars ought to realize to the railroads 300 per cent, or even 200 per cent, and not more possibly than 100 per cent. In the interest not of justice, but of common decency, I move to limit the rental to at least the cost of the cars.

"The Vice-President. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

"Mr. Gore. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

"The yeas and nays were not ordered.

"The amendment was rejected.

In this record we witness on the part of Senator Gore an attempt to prevent the looting of the public treasury to an extent that, as he says, is without the bounds of justice and common decency; to prevent a steal of such proportions that by comparison all that has ever passed through bribery into the hands of city officials in all our cities combined (so far as has come to light) seems insignificant. He fails signally, ignominiously; and the record of his attempt and of his failure is a part of the indisputable record of the doings of our highest legislative body, a record made and approved by that body, a public document.

No political party represented in that body can shift responsibility for that corrupt proceeding. The membership refused the call of yeas and nays although it requires but *one-fifth of those present** to make such a record. Evidently the printing of an unqualified "yes" or "no" opposite the name of each Senator was not desired, at least not by one-fifth of them. The unrecorded vote would be a source of far less trouble for them in the future. It would leave open an avenue of escape when driven to bay by a possibly inquisitive and protesting constituency. And the concealed

*U. S. Constitution, Article I, Section 5.

affirmative vote served the full purpose of the corrupters, the monied interests.

Now here is indisputable evidence of vile corruption in high places, in plain English, of a steal that shocks the sensibilities of every American in any manner capable of comprehending its significance. And who would dare assume that it did not shock the doers of that deed? Using the word in its ordinary sense, to call these Senators thieves is not admissible. There may not be one among them whom one could not in safety personally trust with uncounted gold. Then how are we to account for such conduct in their dealing with or for the public? Such things must be to them a source of deep humiliation; if not, then the statement that they are not in every sense thieves must be reconstructed. There is but one reasonable and sane solution of the apparent mystery that shrouds such conduct. We say "apparent mystery" because, when understood, their deportment loses all that savors of mysticism and becomes evidence absolute of servility. They act under a species of duress; they do what circumstances compel.

In homely English, each one of those Senators (and each one of us) knows that if he participates in the defeat of the railway's ambition to acquire those millions, if he battles and votes against such a vital interest of the monied powers, the chances are many to one that his days as a member of that body are numbered. In fact it is commonly understood, at least by implication, that he will not do so (that he is safe and sane) before he is permitted to assume such a responsible position. His self-justification lies in this, that if he does not "stand in" with the powers that be, they will shelve him and put in his stead another who will. And to his shame and ours, it must be said, that is just what will occur.

If the conduct of a senator or congressman meets with the displeasure of the railway owners and, consequently, of the monied powers and corporations generally (for they are all allied through common ownership and directorates) the venal advocate, the political machine and the capitalist-owned and subsidized press are quietly set to work. Many reasons are found and magnified to any required proportions—all reasons are conjured up and magnified except the real reason—why he is not the proper and most capable man to represent "his constituency"; "more able and available" men in any required number are brought forward, backed by press and politician; the orders go down the entire line and are obeyed as the mandates of an autocrat; and when the conventions or legislatures meet, our Senator or Representative seeking re-election finds himself as friendless as a masterless dog. He is down and out, supplanted by a "statesman" who better understands his real function as a "representative of the people." The facts are not overstated nor exaggerated in a statement issued by the New York Board of Trade that tells us: "The railroads control absolutely the legislatures of a majority of the states of the Union; they make and unmake United States Senators, Representatives, and Governors, and are practically dictators of the governmental policy of the United States."

During the national campaign of 1908, a most nauseating chapter was incorporated in our political history that tells of the downfall of a United States senator from one of the chief abodes of Standard Oil, because it was revealed that sometime, somewhere, he had acted as agent or attorney for that corporation in an effort to secure control of a newspaper. What renders the whole trumped up "exposure" particularly disgusting is its unconcealed evidence of presumptive (or actual) ignorance on the part of the American

people. The whole controversy was waged on the assumption that the people did not know enough to know that no man could be elected to the Senate from that State, by any capitalist party, who was not in all ways acceptable to Standard Oil. The whole function of press and politician seemed to be to play upon ignorance typified by faith in such a myth as the possibility of machine-run, capitalist organizations such as the Republican or Democratic parties of his State actually side-tracking a man for such a cause. If they had been honest enough to tell us that he was dislodged because he had proven *persona non grata* to a few in high places; or that he was so careless as to get caught—but that would have spoiled the entire farce.

In his State or in any other where Standard Oil is a political factor, a candidate who is in any sense considered as inimical to its interests, is, of necessity, confronted at the very threshold of his ambitious venture by not only Standard Oil, but by all of its natural and never faltering allies, its partners in business, in large measure its commonly owned concerns,—the railroads, the banks, the steel trust, the coal trust—the consolidated monied interests of the State and nation. The press and all the cohorts of the political machine are theirs. Against such a combination, a capitalist candidate adverse to Standard Oil would stand about as much of a show to enter high official life and stay there as would a certain proverbial snowball at cooling its adverse environment. Men seeking preferment well understand this—or soon learn it. They do homage to the industrial despot or they enter not his sanctuary.

We have but briefly outlined a system of corruption carried on wholly within the law, wherein no secret bribe is proffered, in which the corrupter simply does in lawful manner what he wills with his own. He employs his agents

and advocates (the political machine) and hires editors for his own private enterprises in journalism. He pays high prices and commands efficient service. And yet here, within statutory limits, is carried on a system of corruption that permeates every nook and corner of the nation and that by comparison dwarfs into insignificance all that was ever unearthed in San Francisco, St. Louis, Pittsburg, Philadelphia, New York, and all the other cities combined.

Like other types of corruption, this all-pervading system is imbedded in the private ownership of our sources of subsistence. It is inherent in the struggle to gain possession of what is exploited from labor. It has no other mission; it can accomplish for the corrupter no other purpose. It will continue as long as that \$8 worth or any part of it is the prize to be gained by such methods—as long as private ownership of industries shall obtain. There is one remedy and one only and that is the fulfillment of the Socialist demand—collective ownership of the sources of life.

Another source of corruption not less insidious than that just discussed is the tainted press. This corrupter, like vice clothed in the garb of virtue, comes into almost every home reeking with misrepresentation, misconstruction, falsehood and filth. Not one paragraph touching the interests of any considerable cash contributor, or advertiser, or the doings of the moneymongers has any claim to credibility. As falsehood or misrepresentation is born of an evil purpose, these periodicals enter our homes a constant flood of mental poison.

One of the best representatives of editorial work in this country tells us in the presence of an important gathering of his craft that the idea of a free or independent or truthful press is a myth; that he is paid \$150 per week not for his opinions, but to put in form what other and interested

parties desire to have said; not to write the truth as he or they know it, but falsehood of which both are cognizant; and that his fellow listeners are doing a like service. There is no report that any denied it. Some ten years ago, another professional writer (William Scholl McClure) in an address before the Albany Press Club, referred to himself and his associates as: "Mental prostitutes, accomplices in rascality, and professional beggars—to such lives does the force of a competitive system reduce us; nor is there any escape so long as the system remains unchanged."

The dispensers of poisonous concoctions, or utterly worthless compounds, as patent medicines, are immune from attack by the press, behind the shield of a contract for advertising that stipulates its nullification if the paper with which the contract is made does not at least remain neutral in and suppress news of any attack through attempted legislation adverse to the interests of the dispensary. A word of adverse criticism, a simple statement of fact, and the contract is canceled.

Yet this press is a more omnipresent and all-pervading source of "information," exerts a greater influence on public opinion than does any other institution of today.

This servility, this toadyism of the press to the monied interests is a condition that circumstances impose upon it. Newspapers and periodicals in general are business enterprises whose sustenance is drawn from the scramble of the exploiters over the division of the \$8 worth daily contributed by the producer. If they had to live from what they can get from the \$2 worth that falls to the lot of needful labor, life's termination for them would be a matter of minutes. And so it must remain as long as that \$8 worth or any part of it is left to scramble over—as long as labor is exploited. A free, truthful, non-corrupting press is as

incompatible with capitalism as anything of which the human mind can conceive.

Whatever in human institutions empowers a man or a set of men to abridge the liberties of others is a source of corruption. The exercise of that power engenders in the subordinate an attitude and a spirit of servility, of hypocrisy, and of cowardice incompatible with true manhood. And it matters not whether that subordinate be in the Senate or in the workshop. The author has addressed audiences wherein laboring men stealthily and nervously guarded all approaches, fearful lest some spying overseer or boss should detect them in the act of listening to doctrine that he might (and doubtless would) construe as treasonous to his or, more generally, his master's interests. This is the experience of every man who ever advocated the rights of the down-trodden. Cowed men and women? Yes, America is full of them—fearful of speech or act that may result in disfavor of a master. And why should they not fear? The master owns their source of life's subsistence—their jobs. At his caprice they can be and are sent adrift; and many there are who have tasted the bitter fruits of loyalty to honor and conviction. But seal their lips as they may, they are still enthralled. A sign is conspicuously displayed or an authoritative announcement is stealthily passed down the line to the effect that if certain capitalistic servants are not landed in office, it will be at once necessary to reduce the working force or suspend operation indefinitely. Mingled with that damning dictate of an enslaver come visions of the road, of the tears of wife and wail of children.

Freedom? We have reached such a stage in the development of our means of production that while those means are private property our liberty is but a mockery, a thing for the political mystic to conjure with.

There is nothing in this loss of freedom to excite wonderment if we recall the actual conditions in which men must now gain a livelihood. We must keep in mind that the industries of the nation are to our people the sources of life's sustenance; that in them our people (producers) must work or die; that the former avenues to at least partial liberty in the great, undeveloped West are now closed; that the displacement of the former independent worker and small tool owner by the machine and factory has absolutely socialized production; that the development of industrial processes has left our producing masses entirely dependent upon access to privately owned concerns. It is only with a realizing sense of conditions as they actually are that this problem of our waning liberties can be approached. The producer is simply driven to bay. He must surrender and beg for quarter; there is left for him no other alternative while he tolerates this system of industry. But there is a way out. Liberty is not past recall; the chains of slavery are not riveted beyond breaking. He can join with his co-laborers and all others who perceive the inevitable trend of human destiny, wrest through the medium of our institutions the powers of government from the hand of organized, corrupting and enslaving greed and proclaim that the sources of subsistence of the people shall henceforth be used for the general welfare, the upbuilding of humanity and not for amassing dividends. This he can do; and, if he would be free, this he must do. Here, as elsewhere, the Socialist is absolutely sure of his ground. No man can be free and uncorrupted while another possesses his certain and only source of life-sustenance. That ownership must be collective or master and slave be perpetual. The difference between the ownership of a man's life as a chattel and the ownership of that to which he must gain access in order

to preserve his life is slight, and, from an economic standpoint, in favor of the latter.

The trail of corruption marks every field of labor. Perhaps the work of no other class of men, except that of the so-called statesmen, is more deeply dyed by capitalism than is that of those who occupy the pulpits of this nation. Thousands of these men are studious and thoughtful and would be progressive if they were free. But while they must receive their daily bread chiefly from the hand of those who fatten upon the \$8 worth exploited from labor, they certainly cannot fly in the face of such an economically determining force. At least they cannot do so and avoid necessity for seeking new fields of activity. Like the official, the statesman, the press, and the laborer, they are repressed, subordinated; and so they will remain as long as industrial tyrants are enthroned. The resultant evil is two fold—a straining of that quality of manhood known as veracity and a suppression of honest conviction. If this is not to be classed as corruption, we must revise the definition of that term.

What has been said regarding those engaged in ministerial work applies with equal force to teachers and professors in our schools and universities. We have witnessed the humiliating spectacle of great institutions of learning bowing in dependence upon the donations of the exploiters of labor. We have heard these enslaving donations heralded as evidence of a righteous stewardship of wealth; the while statesmen gain repute by squandering annually hundreds of millions upon thieving railways and for an enginery of destruction necessary to guard a foreign market. We have seen educators of national repute dislodged for presuming to express an honest conviction on matters discordant to the

ears of some master of industry; and we know that thousands of lips are sealed lest a like fate be meted out to them for similar offenses. Is this the way to build up a splendid, thoughtful, fearless manhood? Or is it the corrupting of authoritative thought and expression at its highest and at what should be its most trustworthy source? Neither men nor institutions can ever be free or uncorrupted while in a condition of industrial dependency—while the nation's sources of subsistence are avenues of exploitation.

It is scarcely necessary to mention the slavish subordination in which tens of thousands of small merchants eke out an existence from the ragtag and bobtail of the \$8 worth supplied by labor. Tucked away in some corner with a little stock of cigars, fruit, groceries, shoddy or junk; or even in more pretentious quarters with so many competitors that to live is a struggle; with the certainty before him that the chances are more than nine to one that his "business venture" is to end in failure; whiling from twelve to sixteen hours of every day in one monotonous grind of effort to realize from petty sales—what is there in such a life that any should seek it except under stress of circumstances that are compelling? Nor need attention be called to the fact that from the very conditions imposed upon him, aptitude at misrepresentation and lying is an essential part of the stock in trade. So thoroughly interwoven into the whole process of exchange has false representation become, that it is universally regarded as conventional.

There is not one element in such a life that is uplifting or ennobling, not one. Not long since one of the prominent lawyers of California said to the author: "In any matter calling for a bold, open stand upon a question of either local or governmental policy, over which there is any marked degree of controversy and in which every man should assert

an interest and act his part, you will find among no other class of our citizens so marked a degree of, well, let us say timidity, as among the merchant class. They tremble lest they possibly offend and thereby lose a dollar in trade."

There is a cause for this state of affairs—for this corrupted condition of manhood—and as in the instances previously cited, that cause lies wholly in economic dependence. The merchant lives by sufferance of others. Not only is he dependent upon local patrons, but at best, he has come to be but a sort of agent for some big concerns—a species of agency in which the principal is relieved from responsibility for the deportment of his subordinate. And even this semblance of liberty is being taken from him. Already in our larger cities, the retailers of meat, tobacco and distilled liquors are but hired men, agents of the wholesaler or manufacturer. A would-be independent retailer finds that his proffered purchases are rejected or he must pay retail prices for stock.

In short humanity is today under sway of an industrial tyranny so powerful that it tyrannizes over tyrants. It has not been many years since J. Pierpont Morgan said in substance that international policies would henceforth be dictated at the round table of the knights of finance; and he never spoke more truthful words or words of greater import. This tyranny is debasing, liberty destroying, corrupting in its every vein. It is the tyranny of the money power of the world. Those who exercise it are in possession of the sources of the nation's subsistence and every dollar's worth from whose possession that power springs is extracted from the toilers through the system of industry called capitalism. "Let the nation own the trusts."

VII.

THE UNEMPLOYED.

In the capitalist system of industry, the means of production—the natural source of raw material, the earth, and the artificial appliances for putting this raw material into useful things, machinery—these absolute requirements to our national existence and our individual lives are private property. They are now dominated by a relatively few members of our order of property-mongers; and we have seen that membership in that order, in its ratio to population, must decrease and not increase.

By far the larger part of our people must use these things—earth and machinery—for productive purposes, must with and through them do all the labor necessary to production. To do this, that is, in order to live, they must gain access to these privately owned means of their livelihood. Now, as this private possession is absolute, is held more sacred than life itself, is backed by every organized force of government, it follows that the right of access to these things and consequently the right of the laborer to life itself is entirely at the disposal of the private owner. He can admit the laborer to this life-source or exclude him from it to suffer and even die of want; and there is nothing in capitalism that dares to question the righteousness of this authority. In other words, the laborer owns the commodity labor-power, but he cannot consume (utilize) it; the master alone owns the means for its consumption. The laborer to live must exchange this commodity for others; but the master's private ownership cuts him off from all compulsory right of exchange.

The master will gladly consume this labor-power, will permit the laborer to make the requisite exchange, only on

condition that through this exchange he, the master, shall acquire more of commodities than fall to the lot of the laborer. Out of the exchange the master must get more value than he parts with; the laborer must give up more than he receives. That is, to live the laborer must submit to that legalized robbery called exploitation.

Such a condition would certainly be reprehensible even if the laborer were granted the right to constant employment, the right to be continuously robbed. What then shall we say of an industrial system that does not even grant him this right (or wrong)?

Since exploitation, profit to the employer, is a requisite to the master's granting employment, it follows that the question as to whether a laborer is to be granted access to, or be shut out from his means of life must find its answer in, at best, temporary industrial conditions. For it is not in human possibility that constancy should characterize such an institution as capitalism. Furthermore, that conditions should ever be such as to demand so much as the temporary employment of all labor at one time is as improbable as that any heavenly body should be absolutely at rest as long as the law of gravitation obtains. "The unemployed we must always have with us"—in capitalism.

The following interesting paragraphs are from "Poverty," by Robert Hunter. It must be noted that all dates herein cited are in times of prosperity when capitalism is at its best:

"The accidental vagrants are the floating element of 'the reserve of labor,' or in other words, of the unemployed classes. They are waiting to be used by the employer. Their vagrancy consists of a restless, agonizing search for employment. The class is a very large one. Upon the basis of the statistics gathered in the census of 1890, Dr.

Washington Gladden estimates that 'there must have been an average of 1,139,672 persons unemployed during the whole of the year ending May 31, 1890.' The census of 1900, as before stated, shows the number unemployed some part of the year to have been 6,468,964. Over 2,069,546 males were unemployed from four to six months, and about half a million males were unemployed practically the entire year. If one were able to determine the proportion of these unemployed persons, who find it necessary to go about from city to city in search of employment, it would show the total number of accidental vagrants. The number changes from year to year in direct relation to the activity of industry.

"So long as the wages of certain classes of workmen are only sufficient to keep them during the period when they are employed, so long as there is an ebb and flow of industrial activity, so long as certain trades employ men at certain seasons only, so long as those who close the factories continue to have no responsibility for the outcast workers, so long as the laws of competitive industry make industrial depressions necessary, and so long as the system of industry demands a surplus of labor which may be but casually employed, so long, indeed, as there is such a thing as enforced unemployment,—just so long will the sources of vagrancy be ever active. Neither artificial employments nor charity provision can remedy the evil. The worker is himself helpless. He is a wastrel, begging to be used in a competitive industrial system which in its present form requires his continued existence."

He is a wastrel begging to be used, etc. Likewise says Charles Booth in "Life and Labor in London:" "The modern system of industry will not work without some unemployed margin, some reserve of labor."

There are various reasons that make necessary this reserve of labor:

First. It prevents a monopoly of the commodity labor-power, a "cornering of the market," as it were. It is to the interest of capitalists that the standard of subsistence, the proportion of labor's product that goes to labor, shall be kept as near the minimum requirement as possible; hence their herculean efforts to throttle any attempt at combination of the owners of that commodity who, by any sort of artificial means, would make it even temporarily more expensive. Such a move on the part of laborers is trespass upon the capitalists' private preserves. As long as this reserve army is kept in the field, as long as there is a plethoric condition in the labor market, there is no imminent danger that the exploiters' share will suffer from excessive demands on the part of the sellers of labor-power.

Recognition of the benefits of a well stocked labor market is by no means modern. John Bellers, who wrote in 1696, is quoted by Marx as saying: "For if one had a hundred thousand acres of land and as many pounds in money, and as many cattle, without a laborer, what would the rich man be, but a laborer? And as the laborers make men rich, so the more laborers, there will be the more rich men . . . the labor of the poor being the mines of the rich." And in a like vein speaks Bernard de Mandeville at the beginning of the eighteenth century:

"It would be easier, where property is well secured, to live without money than without poor; for who would do the work? As they (the poor) ought to be kept from starving, so they should receive nothing worth saving. If here and there one of the lowest class by uncommon industry, and pinching his belly, lifts himself above the condition he was brought up in, nobody ought to hinder him; nay, it is un-

deniably the wisest course for every person in the society, and for every private family to be frugal; but it is the interest of all rich nations, that the greatest part of the poor should almost never be idle, and yet continually spend what they get . . . Those that get their living by their daily labor . . . have nothing to stir them up to be serviceable but their wants which it is prudent to relieve, but folly to cure. The only thing then that can render the laboring man industrious is a moderate quantity of money, for as too little will, according as his temper is, either dispirit or make him desperate, so too much will make him insolent and lazy. . . . From what has been said, it is manifest, that, in a free nation, where slaves are not allowed of, the surest wealth consists in a multitude of laborious poor; for besides, that they are a never-failing nursery of fleets and armies, without them there could be no enjoyment, and no product of any country could be valuable. To make the society" (which of course consists of non-workers) "happy and people easier under the meanest circumstances, it is requisite that great numbers of them should be ignorant as well as poor; knowledge both enlarges and multiplies our desires, and the fewer things a man wishes for, the more easily his necessities may be supplied."

The candor of these gentlemen is truly refreshing.

Second. This reserve army is at the command of the professional strike breaker. Times are never so prosperous that he cannot hurl his battalions in any required number upon any point where the interests of capitalists may be threatened. The fact that thousands may be gathered from the ranks of unemployed at any time and forwarded to any point for any purpose—men skilled in every craft—may be a great convenience to a capitalist under pressure of boding adversity; but it is certainly a damning incident to a system

of industry assailed by an enlightened proletariat. Such a condition is essential to the well working of capitalist exploitation; a knowledge of the real significance of that condition is a most potent element in the overthrow of the power of the exploiter. Abject poverty, the homeless, the vagrant, the pauper, the tramp, the slums with all that these imply are its legitimate and monstrous progeny. But that army is with us and its membership is constantly subjected to every enviroing element that breeds disloyalty to its class, crime, drunkenness, suicide, insanity and prostitution.

Third. This reserve labor force is necessary when capitalism must lead men to war. The armies of earth ever have been and ever must be mustered from the ranks of toil; and the army of toilers on march or on field must be supported by other toilers on farm and in factory. The supply must meet emergency demands of every sort; the strike and the call to arms are but two of them.

Fourth. An important species of emergency demand for labor is found in our institutions that call for large numbers of laborers at certain times of the year. No organized effort is made, nor can such organization be effected in capitalism, to regulate or systematize the flow of labor from one part of the country to another as harvesting in the Mississippi Valley, fruit packing and shipping in California, lumbering in the North, cotton picking in the South, mining now here, now there, each calls for a large quota of workers for but a brief spell. A mass of laborers meets this requirement and is then turned loose to drift elsewhere. The laborers are needed, but it is not a function of capitalism to see that they do more than drift. Its chief concern is that a sufficient force can always be mustered to prevent anything extortionate by way of wages. Its confidence rests in that reserve of unemployed wandering workers that

seldom fails to meet the requirements. The fact that such drifting is compulsory and that the filling of jails and the organization of chain gangs are incidental to it does not disturb the serenity of the exploiter. Many of the wanderers become tramps, professional tramps, but what else could sanity expect them to become? We cannot sow tares and reap turnips.

There is another phase of this problem of the unemployed that merits serious attention. It is in review of this unemployed army that capitalists may well turn their faces in shame; it is upon this host that capitalism does its worst. This army is, and throughout all history has been, the down-trodden of earth. It enlisted the ignorant and debased into whose life there gleamed not a ray of hope for betterment of condition. And while ignorance and debasement predominated in its ranks, it was never a serious menace to any ruling, exploiting power. But

"There is some soul of goodness in things evil,
Would men observingly distil it out."

Excessive fineness of distillation is not necessary in this instance of evil to learn that the "soul of goodness" lies in the certainty that in this army, rapidly recruiting as it is today with a quality and quantity of troops such as it never before mustered, is read the doom of labor exploitation—the overthrow of capitalism. In this horror so long essential to the successful plundering of the poor lay the dwarf that is now rapidly developing into a giant who will raze the pillars of his prison and go forth a freeman. "Retributive justice," say you? Nay, that would be impossible. At best but a fraction of those responsible for the condition we are considering could be reached by any sort of punitive measures; and again, reader, if you are an American citizen who by your exercise of the franchise upholds the present indus-

trial system—who votes any brand of capitalist ticket—you would have to be numbered among the guilty. Nor is that the spirit in which to approach so momentous a proposition. The passing of capitalism is not a retributive measure; it is the evolutionary culminating of a great historic epoch of civilization and the ushering in of Socialism as its natural and logical successor.

This army of laborers subject to the fitful, alternating periods of work and no work incident to capitalism is absolutely and relatively on the increase in every land of earth where modern machinery is installed.

A labor-saving is also a labor-displacing machine; and millions are they who have left workshop, farm, factory and mine as some mechanical device rendered their hand work and more primitive methods obsolete. Bitter and futile has been the strife in effort to bar or dislodge the intruder.* On occasions the opposing laborers met with some degree of success, but it was always temporary. A more economic method of producing things could not be permanently excluded and the machine smashers, as a matter of course, were forced to evacuate.

In some instances the installation of labor-competing and displacing inventions has been rapid and the havoc wrought among the affected marked and wide-spread; in other cases the dislodgment was slow but not the less sure.†

* Abbe Lancellotti (1579) says: "Anthony Muller of Danzig saw, about 50 years ago, in that town, a very ingenious (ribbon) machine, which weaves 4 to 6 pieces at once. But the Mayor being apprehensive that this invention might throw a large number of workmen on the street, caused the inventor to be secretly strangled or drowned." Quoted by Marx, page 428.

† "History discloses no tragedy more horrible than the gradual extinction of the English hand-loom weavers, an extinction that was spread over several decades, and finally sealed in 1838. Many of them died of starvation, many with families vegetated for a long time on 2½d a day."—Marx: "Capital," page 431.

If capitalism had not afforded (or been favored by) some compensating conditions for this chronic plague of displacement of laborers, it would have totally failed long ago.

One of the most inexhaustible of these conditions lay in the vast, fertile and unsettled region of the New World and especially of this continent. There lay an asylum for the millions and thither they went. Westward this vast army wended its way blazing the course of empire in its route. It scaled the Appalachians and swarmed over the vast plains of the Mississippi, Missouri and Platte. It invaded the mighty mountains of the West and thronged on the shores of the Pacific. No other such movement has been witnessed for centuries, nor does human history record its equal in both magnitude and time.

Another condition that favored capitalism was inherent in the inventions that came with such startling rapidity. They paved the way for, they called into being new and immense industries. The demand for implements, machinery and transporting facilities for the development of resources in both old and new territory was so vast that it baffles computation. Its manufacture and transportation, like the undeveloped continent, furnished a vast vent for what would otherwise have been a deluged and unsupportable labor market.

A third source of absorption of the laborers displaced by

In our own country, at a time when there was less pretext for such action than in any country in Europe, the installation of such devices as Howe's sewing machine and McCormick's reaper and mower met most bitter and organized opposition; in numerous instances with the actual smashing of the machines by the displaced laborers. More recent instances are found in savage war waged (in England) by the Sheffield file-cutters, in 1865; and the prolonged and bitter strife and strikes in this country, that grew out of the introduction of machine methods for unloading vessels especially along the Great Lakes.

machinery lay in a servant system that naturally followed the amassing of great fortunes. This demand for attendants upon the rich absorbed tens of thousands directly from the labor market and converted them into an army of hangers-on, lackeys, performing every sort of menial service that ever fell to the lot of slave or serf. The labor market of capitalism may well be thankful as its exploiters parade over the world, or people their mansions, with trains of attendants. Such servility may be humiliating, debasing, but better than the slums or the anguish of the crowded marts of the toilers.

Tens of thousands more found employment in supplying material for the lavish displays of the ever increasing number of the wealthy—a display commensurate with the swelling volume of their holdings. This squandering of labor's product by the rich has ever been regarded as a blessing to the toiler. "It furnishes lots of work; what do we care what they do with their possessions?" are words that have come from the lips of millions. The same quality and degree of blessing would be labor's if the produce were thrown into the sea. And yet, in capitalism, such disgusting utterances are true. Likewise it is true that fortune favors labor when billions of dollars' worth of its product vanish as flames sweep over a Chicago or a San Francisco. In the necessity for rebuilding the city lies labor's opportunity. All this, however, does not qualify the boast that our industrial system, our stewardship of wealth, is the acme of sanity and progressiveness, an institution such as only divine wisdom could bestow.

The dissipation of laborers in great wars was a very considerable means for relieving the over-stocked labor market. Our own great conflict cost about a million such lives; and the wasted labor-product of such a conflict would doubtless

furnish employment for a term of years for half as many more.

But despite the absorption of machine-displaced laborers by every institution possible to capitalism, the hosts of unemployed or partially employed was ever on the increase. With the extension of machinery to and beyond what circumstances would justify, with the absorbing continent filling to every pore, a death-dealing condition inherent in capitalism developed to astounding proportions. The exploiting class soon learned that the part of labor's product that fell to them was in excess of what they could consume. If this excess could not in some way be disposed of, if it were to remain on their hands thus reducing or nullifying necessity for further production, at least two serious consequences must result: first, the unemployed army would soon swell to intolerable and uncontrollable proportions; second, the exploiters' resources, or annual returns, would be seriously if not fatally impaired. And they might have added, capitalism itself would be swamped by conditions of its own developing. An outlet must be found for this unconsumable surplus; it must be disposed of in other lands. There was no possible escape from necessity for development of foreign commerce; no escape from the quest for foreign market.

As long as these markets could be found and occupied, as long as the surplus could be dumped upon other shores, it meant the escape from starvation for labor and the further filling of the coffers of the exploiter—"a consummation devoutly to be wished." It was in these foreign markets that capitalism found and still finds its last possible refuge; there lies its only saving grace. Material extension of all other sources of vent for the labor market—sources that have served capitalism and served it well—cannot longer

meet the requirements of the masses of labor. The present system of industry has already passed that point in its career. The foreign market must be kept open or capitalism is doomed.

In other words, capitalism must provide its laborers an opportunity to acquire a living—must keep them employed to the subsistence point—or its failure and the consequent necessity for its overthrow are self-evident. Without the foreign market such provision is impossible; because, for instance, a fraction of American laborers can, in modern conditions, supply their own subsistence and all that the American exploiters can consume. Then what of the other fraction of the laboring mass? They possess but one commodity, labor-power—the power to produce things, to produce abundantly—but they are (and in present conditions must be) totally deprived of opportunity to utilize that commodity—to consume it or exchange it for things consumable. The means for its utilization are private property and an invasion of such preserves, even to ward off starvation, even to sustain life itself, is treason against the most sacred rights bestowed upon man.

In such circumstances there are but three possible courses for the laboring masses to pursue. First. Submit to the process of elimination of the surplus laborers through starvation. Second. Combine, and compel capitalism (if they could secure the power to do so) to employ all to the subsistence point through a shift system that would shorten the hours constituting a day's work to a fraction of the present number, without either reduction of the nominal wage (the money wage) or an increase of the cost of living. That is, set the price of the commodity labor-power, compel its consumption, and maintain the purchasing power of its price by fixing the prices of all other commodities through

legislative action. Third. They may take possession of the nation's sources of subsistence, exclude the exploiter as an industrial factor, let all share in useful labor and each enjoy that part of the social product to which his individual effort entitles him.

The first of these propositions implies a condition of physical and mental servitude and inferiority, a degradation of manhood, a fetish worship that might in earlier times, in the darker ages of thought, have been imposed upon humanity. But the day of its imposition is passed. Human environment is not now the composite that develops that sort of slave, that species of "loyalty to authority." We reject it as impossible, as unworthy of serious contemplation.

The second proposition is characterized by equal or even greater absurdity than the first. We have already given it attention (page 50), already eliminated it. To assume that the masses of labor in this nation or in any other great power would acquire sufficient intelligence and cohesiveness to wage such a war as would be a requisite preliminary to the establishment of such a régime; to assume that they would attain the mental status necessary to what would practically be the overturning of the present system; to assume that they would organize, capture the powers of government and crowd the exploiters into subordination; to assume all this and then still further assume that the intelligence necessary to its fulfillment would not, long before the consummation of such a routine of action, discern the non-necessity for the exploiter in industry and dispose of him entirely exceeds the bounds of any system of logic that merits even momentary investigation. No, when the problem of the unemployed calls for such drastic action as this second proposition implies, no such bickering and tinkering with an industrial system in effort solely to retain the non-

essential exploiter will be indulged. When labor musters for such an organized fight it will not be checked at the nine-tenths post. With less expenditure of effort than such a protracted campaign would require, properly directed, it will cover the entire course.

The third proposition—the elimination of the exploiter as an industrial factor; the abolition of the right of private property in the sources of our being; the granting of access to the means of production to all who desire to produce and, its corollary, the right of private property in labor's product to the extent of the full social equivalent of one's own labor either mental or manual; the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness that can be secured only through the right of access to the sources of that life, liberty and happiness; the establishment of justice and the abrogation of the privilege to plunder and enslave—in that proposition is imbedded such a degree of fairness, humanity, practicability and necessity as appeals to every enlightened manhood the world over. It is in support of this proposition that the millions are aligning; it is in this they rest their only hope for world progress.

But what of the foreign market? Why will that not continue to serve the purposes of capitalism? There are various reasons why it will not. In the first place capitalism is world wide. The conditions that have been so rapidly maturing in the United States are to a greater or less degree matured in all civilized nations. The machine is doing its work of displacement and augmenting the productiveness of labor in England and in Europe to an extent second only, if second at all, to that in this country. The foreign market is just as much (and in the case of Great Britain more) of an absolute requisite to each of a number of great nations as to ours. Capitalism is similarly developed in and com-

mon to them all and consequently so are its problems. China and more especially Japan so long a fertile field for foreign exploitation are passing at a bound from industrial barbarism to highly developed capitalism. They are already rapping at the world's doors for admission to foreign markets so vigorously that the nations gaze in wonderment. And so it is becoming everywhere that any people of proportions sufficient to be of any consequence as a market are, on the contrary, listing themselves as competitors for the little that remains for all.

If the United States could have absolute sway over some vast foreign territory, capitalism with us might for a goodly number of years be reasonably safe from embarrassing conditions in her labor market; but there is about as much prospect for such an endowment on this country as for one grocery store's being granted the privilege by common consent of monopoly of some large city. So coveted are the market remnants that are now obtainable that the great powers are vying in construction of iron monsters and other enginery of war capable of wresting privilege from any too successful or less thoroughly equipped competitor.

Nor can capitalist countries long hold as a foreign market any territory inhabited by any sort of an intelligent people for any kind of commodities that can be produced within that territory. Our own country is a good foreign market for producers of tea, coffee, silks, tropical fruits and a few such articles for whose production our climate is not well adapted; but outside of these, we have little use for the products of other peoples.

For commodities that are purely surplus, a country whose industries are already developed is practically no market at all. Attention must be called to the significance of that term "surplus" as here used. It means what is left of our

labor product after our people as a whole have consumed all that in existing conditions they can consume. We may, for instance, trade great quantities of steel product with France for silks and consume the silk. In that case we have consumed our steel product just as completely as if we had directly appropriated it to our own use. But after we have done all our trading with countries that have developed industries not adapted to our country and have consumed whatever we got in exchange and all that we can of our own production, there still remains a surplus unconsumable. This we must sell to nations with undeveloped industries and take in payment some sort of securities. In other words, such trade gets that people into our debt; through such trade we acquire financial interest in that country—ownership in her railroads, factories, etc. This is soon followed by ambition to build and own more of her railroads and factories. These furnish an opening for investment of some of our surplus capital where it will yield good returns—a policy we are now following in China and other parts of the East. In short, her resources are being developed and instead of being longer a market for our surplus she has a surplus of her own.

How natural then in capitalism is the bitter strife for control of the markets of a people with undeveloped resources; such as Japan was recently, as China to a great degree still is and as are the Philippines and some Asiatic and South American territory. If a people are fairly progressive, as Japan and China, they, for a time, open a vast market for machinery of all sorts; but the importation of such things soon closes them as a surplus market entirely. We soon find them competitors elsewhere, not purchasers at home.

It follows, then, that as the nations of earth develop

their resources—and they are doing so at a most marvelous rate—they constantly augment the unconsumable surplus of the capitalist world and at the same time diminish the territory that formerly offered a possible market. Like a decreasing variable whose limit is zero, that market approaches its limit.

But capitalism is doomed long before that limit is reached. An unconsumable, unsalable surplus means an unemployed host; that means bitter strife among sellers of labor-power for an opportunity to dispose of that commodity; that means a reduction of the standard of living, a reduction of the part of labor's product that goes to the producer; which in turn means a reduced power of laborers to consume and that means an augmenting of the unsalable surplus and so on and on. The capitalist system is rapidly and of necessity strangling itself; or, 'twere better to say, is rapidly forcing laborers into such condition that they will be compelled to strangle it in self-defense.

It seems superfluous to call attention to so self-evident a fact as that this army of unemployed with all its degradation and suffering; its debarment from access to its sources of life; the surplus product with all its attendant evils; that all these conditions are due to one circumstance and one only—the private ownership of our nation's, yes, and the world's sources of subsistence—due to the circumstance that industries are not built up for the purpose of supplying the needs of man, but as a medium for exploiting human labor, for the making of millionaires.

In a system of collective ownership the industries would be operated and resources developed solely to supply the needs of humanity. Access to them (to the jobs that constitute them) would be free. A desire to labor would imply a desire to enjoy, to consume the social equivalent of that

labor. With a proper adjustment of the returns for labor, a surplus would be impossible; but if such a contingency should arise, the extra product would belong to the producers and not to exploiters, would be a blessing and not as now a curse. Unemployment and consequently poverty would be voluntary, self-inflicted. If one desired to work more than another it would be because he desired in one way or another to consume more of the things of life. That should certainly be his right and privilege. No danger of one's getting too much from his own labor. And what matters it how much one possessed so long as it were not a source of the subsistence of others, so long as he could not use it for labor exploitation—so long as he could not make of it a medium through which to enslave humanity? In such a system if one owned a mansion its possession would be absolute evidence that he worked for it—that society got its equivalent out of him; in capitalism, its possession is ample evidence that in some manner the owner worked others for it—that he got it out of society without rendering an equivalent. He may have acquired the property through inheritance; or through some unearned increment—the augmentation of one's wealth due to the improvement of adjacent properties or the settling up and improving of a community; or through some sort of speculation or sharp dealing—in many ways except through the process of actually producing useful things.

In this problem of the unemployed capitalism faces its finish. Were it not for this, wealth might concentrate and its attendant corruption increase in like proportion; the nation might rot as did the ancient empires and as our country is now rapidly rotting. But today labor is superior in intellect, is better trained mentally, has a much more intimate knowledge of matters pertaining to government,

natural science, sociology and history than had the workers of former periods. They are the product of a very different environment from that in which any others ever lived. They are rapidly learning what the machine is doing for them (to them) while it is held as private property. They are learning (capitalism is thrusting the knowledge upon them) that the present system of industry must be totally replaced by a system of collective ownership of our nation's resources. Nothing could be more plainly inevitable than necessity for this change of system. It is that, or, its only alternative, the destruction of what we know as civilization—a thought too loathsome for lodgment in the brain of any but a savage.

But such change can be wrought only by an organized effort on the part of those to whom the present system is intolerable—the producing, exploited masses and all others who are moved by a sense of justice and reason and a humanitarian spirit.

These are rapidly arraying as an economic class with this one great object in view, to take possession of the industries of earth and operate them for the general good and benefit of mankind—to eliminate the exploiter from industry.

Here then are the conditions that confront the world:

1. The present system of industry makes imperative its own dissolution.
2. That dissolution must be wrought by those who are not the beneficiaries of the capitalist system.
3. Then there must inevitably follow an increased struggle for possession of our sources of subsistence.

That struggle is of necessity between the present possessors on the one hand, and, on the other, the dispossessed combined with those who discern the inevitable trend of civilization and those who read the doom of their possessions in the rising sun of the billionaires.

This is the class struggle—a condition not made by any man or set of men; but a condition evolved out of a system of industry as naturally as effect ever followed cause. That a struggle is inevitable is as patent as that power once vested is never voluntarily surrendered. In the language of John Clark Ridpath: "The privileged classes of mankind have no conscience on the subject of their privilege. History does not adduce one instance in which a nobility or even a monopoly, entrenched in precedent and custom, has ever voluntarily made restitution to society of the rights of which she had been despoiled. The iron jaws which close on the marrowy bone of privilege never relax until they are broken." Those who know enough of history and of human hoggishness to know that this is true and that the jaws of capitalism *must be loosened from their marrowy bone* are class conscious. They realize the inevitability of this great economic-class struggle. The word, so far as it enters the Socialist vocabulary, has no other meaning. This struggle is not born of personal dissatisfaction, nor of hate, nor of love of or desire for strife. It has its origin and its sustenance solely in necessity born of economic evolution. What thoughtlessness, or ignorance, or willful attempt to deceive, then, is apparent in the rantings of the capitalist advocate or politician who denounces as enemies of mankind and promoters of hate and violence all who call the attention of their fellows to this great scientific fact.

The class struggle is on and was taking definite shape in the conduct of tens of thousands of Americans decades ago who had never heard such a designation of their doings. The formation of capitalist combines and associations and of national-wide labor unions was with us its first formal expression, the inception of an organized movement toward the most momentous revolution ever conceived by human

brain. And yet, underlying it all, is that simple demand for justice, a demand so in accord with our most fundamental conceptions of human rights that none in reason dare gainsay it: "To the laborers shall belong the product of their creation."

VIII.

PANICS.

Of all the monstrosities of capitalism none is more conspicuous or more terrible than that known as a panic. In the regular course of nature the rainfall varies in any locality and in some more than in others. Practically all parts of the earth are more or less subject to famine, In some localities these variations are excessive, and as a consequence, millions starve, a large per cent of them even starve to death. Famine is as natural as the shifting of the wind and in the early conditions of the race so was its deadly work. Our savage and barbarous ancestors suffered, starved and died solely because it was impossible to procure sufficient to keep body and soul together. It is left for civilization to develop the artificial conditions in which ourselves suffer and starve and die because we are so abundantly able to produce every requirement of life.

Incongruous, absurd and awful as seems such a charge against civilization, that very condition—starving in the midst of plenty, starving because of plenty, starving because of unused, idle means for preventing want—is a regular visitant to capitalist countries. Such a condition is intermittently foisted upon us as a consequence of an industrial system whose power to perpetuate itself is lodged in the

ignorance, thoughtlessness, fetich worship of one class and the avarice and dominance of another.

In the United States are the greatest number of fertile acres in any civilized country on earth. We have as rich or richer and more extensive mines of every metal than any other land and the way paved to their deposits. We have developed the richest and most extensive oil fields in the world. In a word, our natural resources are far in excess of any demand upon them. In the second place we have a greater amount of machinery than is used in any other country in the world and its productiveness is certainly exceeded by none anywhere on earth. Thirdly, we have laborers of every required number and of every requisite degree of skill. Fourthly, we have brain sufficient to guide all the muscle and all the machinery to the limit of each in supplying the wants of man.

In such conditions, if every want is not supplied, if involuntary suffering from poverty exists, if any are in need who are willing to work, it is evidence absolute of a fatal defect in matters industrial. That defect is not due to any lack of means for supplying human needs. Then there is left but one thing possible to which it can be attributed—lack of proper organization on the part of society, organization based upon the interests and welfare of its members.

Our mighty means for supplying every want become, in the capitalist system of industry, a means for our industrial undoing; a means for subjecting a great mass of mankind to enforced poverty, idleness, vice and crime. Nor in the present regime can such consequences be avoided.

Attention has already been called to the displacement of laborers by machines and to the fact that capitalism would ere now have wrought its own undoing had not certain attendant circumstances opened avenues of escape. It was

furthermore shown that the conditions attending the rise of capitalism called for vast factories, the opening of mines, the manufacture of great quantities of machinery, the building of steamships and railways, in short, the construction and installation of new and vast means for carrying on the work of the world. And these requirements were of such degree relative to the number of displaced laborers as can never again be afforded in this or any other land.

It is worthy of especial note that millions of laborers have been employed in this vast task of construction and extension of labor-saving devices and with every increase came a relatively augmented production. Labor consumed the part that fell to its lot—furnished a never failing market for its share of the product. But there was ever an increasing volume of produce that the exploiters must consume or sell in other lands. There constantly obtained an increasing requirement for foreign markets, the stability of industry increasingly depended upon the ability of the exploiters to dispose of their surpluses in non-developed countries.

At every stage in this vast process of development when construction and extension and consequently production had outgrown the demands of the hour, an undisposable surplus necessarily accumulated. Then there was nothing left for capitalism to do but to stop the wheels of industry—stop producing until some disposition could be made of the burdensome surplus. The factories, mills and mines had to be closed, thus disqualifying labor for the scant market that at best it affords and increasing dependence upon the consuming power of the exploiters and foreigners. Labor must wait, must suffer from hunger and idleness, until what it had produced in such abundance could be consumed by others. A panic was on.

The construction and extension periods when labor is

building up for its own certain future undoing are known as "periods of prosperity"; and the regular alternation between these "good times" and their consequent years of depression and stagnation are as natural in capitalism as the greed of the exploiter.

Again with every increase in the productiveness of labor, came an increase in the actual and relative volume of produce that fell to the share of the exploiters. That meant increased profits or dividends and that called for increased volume of stocks and bonds. Practically speaking, every \$4 (or even less) that can be assured in dividends means the retention at par value of a \$100 certificate of stock. In "prosperous times" these dividends run high and the stocks issued upon them run higher. Speculation and gambling in these paper representatives of wealth, real or mythical, run riot as long as there is a fair prospect of dividends or of stock dispositions. Their excesses outrun even that of production in industry and when the accumulating surplus of produce begins to manifest itself, when sales are not keeping pace with the market supply, these gamblers are the first to realize what it means. Then follows a wild stampede to unload such stocks as must soon feel the biting effect of what must follow—depression in business. Such a stampede means a slump in stock values, bankruptcy of gamblers and brokers, calls for money loaned, restriction of ability to borrow, the hoarding of cash, money stringency, in short, a financial crisis. There is nothing surprising in the fact that an approaching period of depression such as must follow the accumulation of an undisposable surplus of produce should first manifest itself in the financial centers. In fact, it would be surprising were it otherwise. But back of all the financial flurries and crises is the great world of production and exchange of commodities. While that world is in normal

condition, while that will guarantee dividends, there is no danger of a general panic emanating from the financial centers. When, however, that mighty world market assumes a threatening aspect, the few financiers of great holdings have the country at their mercy. They can crush at a single blow not only the financial world but the industrial as well into bankruptcy, idleness and stagnation. And this they do as mercilessly as a tiger crushes its prey. It's their way of "getting from under"—get the other fellow under.

Financial flurries and crises may be purely local and temporary as they often are—may grow out of an overheated contest between bulls and bears at any time; but an industrial panic has a very different basis and can never be so circumscribed. In fact, so thoroughly world wide is capitalism, so alike dependent are all the developed nations upon disposition of their surpluses, that industrial panics are now of necessity as wide in their awful work as capitalism. When the market conditions stop production on the part of the laborers of the United States, those of the other leading powers soon join the ranks of the unemployed.

It is during these crises in industry that the unemployed problem assumes its most menacing proportions. The privately owned industries cannot then be operated at a profit to the exploiter and therefore they cannot be operated at all. The fires are quenched, the great machinery lies dead. The fact that these concerns are the source of life-sustenance to the vast body of laborers is of no concern to the owners. Labor stands ready to produce its own living and more, far more, and there lie the means for doing so and the only means; but this is not a considerable circumstance with the private possessor. The producers may starve and die in sight of plenty and with every required means at hand for producing more. It matters not; those things were con-

structed for the purpose of making profit, as a medium through which to exploit labor, and when they cannot fulfil that requirement they shall remain with barred doors. And labor casts one longing, lingering look upon them and turns sadly away.

A laborer of any intelligence feels and knows that he and his fellow wage workers include all that are necessary to run any of those institutions from janitor to manager and salesman; that the drawer of dividends on the stock of the concern who may seldom or never see the factory or institution and who ordered it closed, is no more essential to its supplying the needs of man than he will be when he is dead. Yet so intense is labor's worship of the fetich, private property, that many will starve rather than so much as vote for the orderly and peaceful replacement of such a system by one in which they could not be denied access to the sources of their being. But 'twill not always be thus. Labor is learning a great lesson; the panic is a fountain of inspiring thought.

Whether the panic that broke with such fury upon us in November, 1907, can ever fully pass, whether the condition that capitalists call "general prosperity" can ever again be established is an open question. To revive those conditions, labor must again return to its work; and what is it going to do? The vast field of extension and construction, the building of machinery, factories and railways is practically closed. We have more now than can be safely used; then why continue to build? Without this work this army of builders are idle unless they be turned into producers of commodities for immediate exchange; and that implies a greater demand both at home and abroad than ever before. Upon what can we base justification for hope of a return of prosperity?

Some of the great captains of industry and finance tell

us that our standard of living is too high, that wages must be reduced in order that production may be cheapened. That means, if it means anything, that whereas labor now receives one-fifth of the product, it must in the future be content with one-sixth or less. In that condition, labor is even a more wretched market than now and the surplus must be accordingly augmented. If it means that wages must be reduced solely for the purpose of reducing prices generally in like ratio, then there is no reduction in either real wages or standard of living. The possible further conquest of foreign market through the medium of cheap products may be the incentive to such desires; but if labor's standard of living is really to be reduced, the loss of market at home would doubtless more than offset any gain abroad. Capitalism is certainly lining up "between the devil and the deep sea."

But grant the possibility of successful conquest of foreign market and what follows? We get the market by wresting it from others. Our success means the defeat of others; the laborers in the land of our unsuccessful competitor are forced into the army of the unemployed and finally to a standard of living below ours in effort to regain their lost prestige. Then, in turn, another reduction on our part? And all this that parasites may, at least for a brief period, continue their privileges to plunder? Possibly so, but not unless judgment shall have "fled to brutish beasts and men have lost their reason." To what condition of servitude are we doomed in order that we may retain our blessed plutocracy? Or will humanity awaken to the real demand of the hour and turn the exploiters as such adrift?

Lest some capitalistic reader should question the authenticity of this outline of the cause of panics and classify this version of the outcome of our industrial conditions and institutions as gloomy and pessimistic, it is well here to

introduce a capitalist authority by way of confirmation and contrast.

On March 1, 1907, Hon. Leslie M. Shaw while Secretary of the United States Treasury under President Roosevelt, delivered a lecture to the students and faculty of the University of Chicago. It must be kept in mind while perusing his words that they were uttered during what was universally held by capitalists to be a period of unparalleled prosperity and about seven months before the panic broke with such force and disaster upon us; that they were spoken by a high government official and in the presence of one of the most intensely critical audiences that it is any man's privilege to address; and that he knew that his words would be given as wide a circulation as anything that he could possibly utter. Thoughtless, reckless expression is not consistent with such conditions. Among other things Mr. Shaw told us:

"The time is coming when the manufactories will outgrow the country, and men by the hundreds of thousands will be turned out of the factories. That in itself is not so bad, but when we realize that we pay out in wages as much as all the rest of the world put together, we begin to see the seriousness of the situation.

"The factories are multiplying faster than our trade, and we will shortly have a surplus, with no one abroad to buy, and with no one at home to absorb it, because the laborer has not been paid enough to buy back what he created. What will happen then? Why, these men will be turned out of the factories. Thousands of them—hundreds of thousands. They will find themselves without food. Then will come the great danger to the country, for these men will be hard to deal with."

Evidently Mr. Shaw is thoroughly conversant with the

cause of panics and is not likely to be misled by learned dissertations upon "lost confidence," "approaching elections," "a species of universal mania or insanity," "sun spots," etc. He finds a real cause in our overgrown factories, our surplus product with no one abroad to buy and no one at home to absorb it, and finally, the cause of all the causes, "*because the laborer has not been paid enough to buy back what HE created.*" From such a capitalist authority such an admission is refreshing. But how is Mr. Shaw going to retain the capitalist system of industry and pay labor enough to buy back what it creates? As that is a self-evident impossibility, it is doubtless Mr. Shaw's conviction that the system has about served its usefulness. His subsequent remarks further confirm this inference.

So much for Mr. Shaw's version of the cause of panics. He is certainly in accord with authority on that matter. Now for his version of the blessings that are to be ours as the legitimate and natural consequences of the system of industry for which his political party stands sponsor. On this all important point he says: "The last century was the worst in the world's history for wars. I look to see this century bring out the greatest conflict ever waged in the world. It will be a war for markets, and all the nations of the world will be in the fight as they are all after the same markets for the surplus of their factories."

Did ever a more shocking, revolting utterance fall from tongue or pen? As one contemplates the awful significance of those words, it requires but little attuning of the ear to hear the applause they awakened in hell.

He is addressing hundreds, possibly thousands of young men, and as he casts their horoscope we read: Train well both mind and body. You may contemplate a life of usefulness, of praiseworthy service to humanity. You will soon

be undeceived. Capitalism has destined you for slaughter as certainly as it has the cattle in yonder yards. The strength and endurance of your manhood is to be tested by the sword; the keenness of your vision by its certainty in landing the deadly missile. Think you that you hear the applause of a grateful people for your splendid service in alleviating human suffering, in ameliorating human conditions? Deluded youths, that is the sound of gushing blood from the body of a slain "enemy" whom you have never personally met or heard of and against whom you have no cause for grievance. Capitalism must have a market for labor's product that it is unable otherwise to squander and you are destined a sacrifice upon that altar. Go like men to meet your appointed doom.

And mothers, what says he to you? There stands your splendid boy. You went down to the very gates of death that he might be. You have cherished him with a love beyond compare. And to what avail? That he may join with millions of his fellows in the universal slaughter of his brothers. Carnage world wide; scenes over which the demons of hell will gloat—this is where he must play his part. He has produced a vast store of the things necessary to make life worth living. He has been robbed of the major portion of that product; and in order that the bandits may successfully dispose of their loot, he must join in the slaughter of all whose life's interests may bar the gates of the market. The bandits have no claim to that mart; it is in other lands and the heritage of another race. It matters not. With the passport of a declaration of war countersigned by the strong arm of a conquering host, they will seal their right through might in the blood of its defenders.

Fathers, you and your grandsires have withstood the

horrors of war that this land might be free; that it might be a land of noble sons and a splendid manhood. When your work was done, the prospect shone with bright hopes. To what purpose all this? That we might attain power to sweep the seas of their commerce; to crush with murderous iron heel the fruits of centuries of toil of muscle and brain; to destroy civilization the world over, hoary with age and teeming with progress. And why? That exploiters may carry on their work of plundering; that a relatively few may revel in the luxuries that other hands produced; that they may find market for goods that are needed at home—needed by those who created them.

Universal carnage, universal slaughter—this, then, is the prospect, the certainty that capitalism lays before humanity; this is its logical and necessary outcome. And all for markets of which we would stand in no need were it not for the exploiters of human labor—the despoilers of earth. This, then, is the ripened fruit that blossoms in a panic. Here is capitalism's solution of the problem of the unemployed.

The fullness of meaning of the quoted words is not upon us until we contemplate the fact that if capitalism is to obtain, these awful utterances are true. That hideous system can have no other outcome. Such progeny, such monstrosities are its natural and legitimate offspring.

But where is the psychologist, or criminologist, or naturalist who can analyze, or classify the status, or quality, or species of mind that can comprehend as clearly as does this man the causes that breed such appalling effects and still says to his countrymen that it is their duty as American citizens to support to the utmost of

their ability a political organization whose sole function is to uphold such a system of industry? Why does he court the powers that are inevitably hurling us into such an abyss? He has told us that the panic must come and why it must come; and it came and for just the reason that he specified. Then, as if to emphasize his discernment of things as they are, he goes still farther and says: "One great source of danger is in the unearned increment of our wealth. I admit that I have profited by that source myself, but I realize now that it is all wrong. I remember the first time I was guilty of getting something for nothing. I bought a piece of land in Iowa and sold it in a short time for a large advance. I admit that those dollars 'looked good' to me then. Now I know that no lasting good can come from the possession of wealth that is not earned."

No good can come from such possessions and he has told us of the terrible harm and disaster that is naturally born of such holdings. Yet he still insists that we should support the political organizations whose sole function is to foster such acquisitions and defend their possession as the most sacred right of man. Private property in our sources of subsistence is, as has already been shown, vested in unearned increments of various types, and the product of his land speculation is but one of them. Would he dare hold that the dividends and profits—the billions—out of which labor is exploited are any less unearned than were those dollars that "looked good" to him then but are now troubling his conscience? Possibly, for a man's economic interests commonly make him see in many directions not indicated on conscience's index.

Evidence of the failure of capitalism to meet the re-

quirements of twentieth century civilization is everywhere apparent. We boast of ability to produce tens, hundreds, thousands of times more than could our ancestors from equal expenditure of human energy. And what avails all this so far as the great mass of humanity is concerned? Palaces? Yes, for the few; and in their long shadows lurk the cringing forms of millions of our people whose very blood was transmuted into the marble columns and granite walls. Machinery? Such as makes the wildest dreams of fairy land look commonplace; and we put it under lock and key of private ownership and restrict its function to the creation of dividends. Produce? We can create sufficient for half a world; still poverty and wretchedness everywhere and one-tenth of our great cities' millions carried to the Potter's field. Business ability? Yes, in abundance and trained to a degree unparalleled in all the past; and the nation, yea, the world periodically bankrupt, poverty stricken. Willing workers? A nation of them; with millions in enforced idleness and tens of thousands shivering in the bread lines of charity. All this is not, as some contend, due to the mismanagement of capitalists. We cannot say to them, "Gentlemen, you have mismanaged and must make way for others." The present system of industry is incapable of management. While labor-power remains a commodity its surplus product must go to the exploiters. That surplus is greater than they can consume or dispose of; and no degree of management can prevent the accumulations that force stagnation and panics. It is of the \$8 worth that panics and poverty alike are born. It is the capitalist system of industry that must go, that must be totally supplanted by a co-operative commonwealth.

IX.

ENSLAVEMENT OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN

The sharing of women and children in the work of production is by no means a recent or modern institution. Women and children have always performed their part in this work and, especially since agriculture became an occupation, that part has been an important one. In the later stages of barbarism and the earlier eras of civilization, the production of bread was largely in their hands. They had their part in the planting, in the reaping of harvests, in the threshing, in the grinding—in every process of production. In fact, it was the machine that drove the women and children so largely from farm labor. Until almost within the memory of our older citizens, carding, spinning and weaving was, in large measure, their task. This was home work—communal labor—and each shared in it as conditions required. But almost all of such labor is now a stranger to the home. The great factory has absorbed it all—and absorbed the women and children as well. Yes, mother and child have always done their part, and doubtless the race, or at least such as the Americans, entered the machine age physically better and stronger because of this labor. It was performed in healthful quarters, in open air, in field and in forest. The environment was invigorating, life breathing. There was restful variety through it all. There was a chance for pause, opportunity for conversation and joviality. Its movements, its hours were not timed to the beating of the iron heart of an engine. The workers were not under the lash of a slave driver. It was life close to nature. There was alternation of play and work, work and play.

The birds, the flowers, the babbling brooks were there and the great blue dome over all.

Yes, savagery, barbarism, civilization called upon woman and child to share in life's struggles; but it remained for the age of machinery, the age of "society," the age of the billionaire, the age of general suffrage and democratic governments, the age of triumphant science and free public schools, the age of marvelous inventions—marvelous means of production—to enslave them body and soul. It remained for this age of progress to reduce millions of them to a servitude in which they may well envy the condition of the mediæval serf or the black slave of the southland.

No right-minded person would contend that women and children should not work, should not share in the labor necessary to produce the food, clothing and shelter, the necessities and the luxuries of life. Pampered ease is a curse to which no one should be subjected; but inflicting slavish toil is a crime that should and will damn the people that tolerates it. Every child should be taught to work just as he should be taught to read and to think; in simultaneously training mind and body, we lay the foundation of a useful, industrious, thoughtful manhood. But a system of industry that subjects women and children to toil—and that unnecessarily—is an infamous thing that should be wiped off the earth by an outraged humanity.

To work, to handle tools and machinery, to actually make useful things from raw material—this should be required of every boy and every girl every day of school life. The idea (and practice) of capitalism that young men and women should first get an education and then go out into the world and learn how to do something, how

to be of some account to themselves and others, is in keeping with the fallacies of the whole system. An industrial regime that destines a majority of a nation's children to the ranks of bread-winners before they can progress even beyond the work of the sixth year of school life, that leaves them practically illiterate, offers small opportunity for preparation for anything but a life of dependence and servility. However, such beings may make fairly good slaves—the chief requisite in capitalist industry.

The mockery of industrial instruction known as manual training is gradually gaining a footing in some of the schools of the country. So far as it goes and for the few that it affects, rudimentary and stingy as it is, it beats nothing.

When our industrial system has evolved to the requirements of twentieth century civilization, the spectacle of a young man's or woman's leaving a university at the age of from twenty-two to twenty-five, wholly unfit to make a living in the industries, will be a thing of the past. "What, give them all such a course of industrial training as will teach each a trade?" says some capitalist adherent. Yes, every boy and every girl. Why some and not others? Would such a course be lost even on a doctor, or lawyer, or scientist? Hardly. And again, it is the scientific way to educate—strengthen the brain through muscular action and train the hand through thought-governed manipulation. This will be the Socialist means for qualifying each for a universal requirement—that he make his own living.

The author while visiting an institution in Kansas City that furnished real industrial instruction to a very small per cent of that city's youths, called the attention

of the principal to the good quality of work but inadequate provisions for it. "But," he replied, "it would be a tremendous expense to supply such advantages even for every pupil in the larger cities, not to mention those of the smaller places and the country." That condenses the whole matter in a nutshell. Capitalism cannot afford thus to train its boys and girls and perhaps it is as well for that system that it doesn't. A little learning is a dangerous thing—for capitalism or any other species of tyranny.

Capitalism cannot afford such facilities for educating its manhood and womanhood. Certainly not. But it can afford to hand over a hundred million dollars a year to a Rockefeller for playing golf and talking to Sunday school classes. A little item like fifteen millions a year to a Carnegie for sitting around in the shades of Skibo and moralizing about the curse of dying rich, does not in the least disturb its equanimity; though probably no other funds ever collected represent so relatively great an expenditure of human life, an equal relative degree of murder.* It can squander enough millions annually on the depraved rich of New York City alone to build, equip and

*The *Literary Digest* of January 16, 1909, says: "Pittsburg is to industrial America what Washington is to the nation politically, and for this reason a group of from ten to thirty expert sociologists have been investigating Pittsburg for a year, finding out things that the city itself did not know, and laying the foundations for reforms to stop the loss of life that is wasting the city's human assets. This investigation is called "The Pittsburg Survey," and is partly financed by the Russell Sage Foundation. Its results are published in *Charities and the Commons* (New York). Pittsburg is a city of Slavs, Italians, Poles, negroes, Irish, Scotch, English, Germans, Jews, Syrians, Bohemians, Japanese, Corn-Planter Indians, and Americans. It might seem hopeless for the sociologist, however learned, to try to bring order out of all this chaos, but it was done by remembering that all these races are in Pittsburg with one object—to work. And if work is their object, it would seem that they

maintain many thousands of such schools. It can spend hundreds of millions annually in equipping for defense or conquest of a market for what it legally filches from the toilers. It can constantly support in luxurious idleness and in parasitic employments such an army of humanity as, were their energies rightly directed, could easily produce many times the entire cost of bringing to splendid maturity every boy and girl in America. It can—but enough. Such capitalistic pleas, in the lime-light of facts, are nauseating to intelligence. When the class struggle has ended and that \$8 worth goes to its producers, the training that should be and will be the heritage of every child will be an inconsiderable item and the best investment of civilization.

Yes, men, women, and children should work and the necessity for their doing so should be imperative. No

get their fill of it. *Twelve hours a day is the rule for most of them, leaving them so exhausted that there is no time or inclination for reading, recreation, religion, or even home life. One man, after many years of such work, remarked that he would have been happier in the penitentiary.*

It was found that as high as 50 per cent of all young foreigners who come to Pittsburg contract typhoid fever within two years of their arrival. Employment agencies, under no adequate supervision, were discovered in some cases to be carrying on an infamous business. *In one part of Homestead, near the Carnegie Steel Works, it was found that one baby in every three died before seeing its second birthday.* Worst of all is the frightful toll of life taken by accidents. A Japanese veteran of the recent war told one of the investigators that "he looks upon his experience upon battlefields as quite commonplace compared with his experience in the steel mills." *Over five hundred men are killed every year in the course of their work, and an unknown number seriously injured. The victims are usually the pick of the men; they are the young men; half of them are native-born; 51 per cent. have families, and 30 per cent. more are single men who partly, or wholly, support their families. The money loss to Pittsburg from this destruction of the workers is declared to be enormous, and the city is told that it can well afford to spend millions in devising ways to stop it."*

greater blessing can ever fall to the lot of each. But the nation that subjects its womanhood and childhood (or manhood, for that matter) to such conditions of toil as now obtain over a large part of the United States is rotting in its vitals and is unworthy of perpetuity. It is fostering the elements of its own destruction; like the mythical demon of the ancients, it feasts upon its own offspring.

There are about 2,000,000 children under the age of 15 years employed in the industries of this nation. Hundreds of thousands of them are toiling in such conditions as would shame the old institutions of serfdom and chattel slavery.

For the South, let one speak who has looked upon it. Elbert Hubbard tells us: "Many of the black slaves lived to a good old age, and they got a hearty enjoyment from life.

"The infant factory slaves of South Carolina can never develop into men and women. There are no mortality statistics; the mill owners baffle all attempts of the outside public to get at the facts, but my opinion is that in many mills death sets the little prisoner free inside of four years. Beyond that he cannot hope to live, and this opinion is derived from careful observation and interviews with skilled and experienced physicians who practice in the vicinity of the mills.

"Boys and girls from the age of six years and upwards are employed. They usually work from 6 o'clock in the morning to 7 o'clock at night. For four months in the year they go to work before daylight and they work until after dark.

"At noon I saw them squat on the floor and devour their food, which consisted mostly of corn bread and ba-

con. These weazened pigmies munched in silence, and they toppled over in sleep on the floor in all the abandon of babyhood. Very few wore shoes and stockings; dozens of the little girls of say 7 years of age wore only one garment, a linsey-woolsey dress. When it came time to go to work the foreman marched through the groups, shaking the sleepers, shouting in their ears, lifting them to their feet, and, in a few instances, kicking the delinquents into wakefulness. The long afternoon had begun—from a quarter to 1 until 7 o'clock they worked without respite or rest.

"The toddlers I saw, for the most part, did only one thing—they watched the flying spindles on a frame twenty feet long, and tied the broken threads. They could not sit at their tasks; back and forth they paced, watching with inanimate, dull look the flying spindles. The roar of the machinery drowned every other sound—back and forth paced the baby toilers in their bare feet, and mended the broken threads. Two, three or four threads would break before they could patrol the twenty feet—the threads were always breaking.

"The noise and the constant looking at the flying wheels reduce nervous sensation in a few months to the minimum. The child does not think, he ceases to suffer—memory is as dead as hope; no more does he long for the green fields, the running streams, the freedom of the woods, and the companionship of all the wild, free things, that run, climb, swim, fly or burrow. He does his work like an automaton; he is a part of the roaring machinery; memory is sealed, physical vitality is at such a low ebb that he ceases to suffer. Nature puts a short limit on

torture by sending insensibility. If you suffer, thank God—it is a sure sign you are alive.”

And then the same author adds:

“The overseer is not a bad man, but he has to make a report to the superintendent—there must be so much cloth made every day.

“The superintendent is not a bad man, but he has to make a daily report to the president of the company, and the president has to report to the stockholders.

“The stockholders live in Boston, and all they want is their dividends.”

And these stockholders are the fellows who, when their dividends fail, order these industries closed; and shut these wretched slaves from even such means of life as these perditions afford.

Robert Hunter for years made a study of child labor conditions in the North and East. Let us quote some of his words from “Poverty:”

“At this moment, after one hundred years of war has been waged for the abolition of child slavery, over 1,700,000 (figures from census of 1900) children under fifteen years of age are toiling in fields, factories, mines, and workshops.

“These figures mean little to most persons, for, as Margaret MacMillan has said, ‘You cannot put tired eyes, pallid cheeks, and languid little limbs into statistics;’ and neither can any one, by any effort of the imagination, call up before the mind’s eye the human units in census figures. . . . They are figures which we see, and not children, and figures come before the eye and are forgotten. We should never forget one sight of a hundred of these little ones if they were marched out of the mills, mines, and factories before our eyes, or if we saw them to-

gether toiling for ten or twelve hours a day or a night for a pittance of wage; but that we do not see, and we forget figures. New York City has not so many children; all the thousands on the streets are not so many as these children of the workshops. . . .

"In the mining districts of Pennsylvania children labor under conditions which are, if possible, even more injurious to them than the child labor of the cotton-mills is to the children of the South. In the mills, mines, and factories, before the furnaces, and in the sweatshops of Pennsylvania, that state of colossal industrial crimes, one hundred and twenty thousand little ones were, in the year 1900, sacrificing a part of their right to life, most of their right to liberty, and all of their right to happiness, except perhaps of a bestial kind. . . .

"The girls go to the mills, the boys to the breakers. A year or two ago Mr. Francis H. Nichols said regarding these working children: 'I saw four hundred lads working in the breakers. One of the children told me, 'We go to work at seven in the morning and stay until six in the evening.' 'Are there many in the breakers younger than you?' he asked one of the children. 'Why, sure, I'm one of the oldest; I'm making sixty cents. Most of them is eight and nine years old.' Mr. Nichols then asked, 'Did you ever go to school?' 'To school?' the child echoed; 'Say, mister, you must be a green hand. Why, lads in the anthracite doesn't go to school; they works in the breakers.' They do not go to school, but instead they are put to work as soon as they can be trusted not to fall into the machinery and be killed. There is hardly any employment more demoralizing and physically injurious than this work in the breakers. For ten or eleven hours a day these children of ten and eleven

years stoop over the chute and pick out the slate and other impurities from the coal as it moves past them. The air is black with coal dust, and the roar of the crushers, screens, and rushing mill-race of coal is deafening. Sometimes one of the children falls into the machinery and is terribly mangled, or slips into the chute and is smothered to death. Many children are killed in this way. Many others, after a time, contract coal-miners' asthma and consumption, which gradually undermine their health. Breathing continually, day after day, the clouds of coal dust, their lungs become black and choked with small particles of anthracite."

Some states, Illinois, for instance, have enacted and attempted to at least partially enforce labor laws forbidding the employment of children under 16 years of age. Of this law the meat trust, with headquarters in Chicago, says:

"The child-labor law has done more harm than good in the stockyards' industry. Before the enactment of the statute forbidding the employment of children under 16 years of age, many of them obtained profitable work in the packing plants. Now they run at large in the neighborhood, for their parents will not keep them in school. As a matter of fact, a boy who has not learned to work by the time he reaches 16 years of age, never will learn. He has, on the other hand, acquired habits that make him unfit for work!"

True, if he is not taught before he is 16, the chances are largely against his ever learning either to work or think. But what are the conditions in which these philanthropic gentlemen propose to impart this essential instruction? Let A. M. Simons of Chicago answer:

"When it is remembered that these children were em-

ployed in catching the blood that flowed from the slaughtered animals, cleansing intestines for sausage casing, etc., some idea of the elevating influences from which the child-labor law took them is gained."

Capitalism is rotten through and through and consistent in its rottenness. It would train these boys and girls for its slave pens; it can offer nothing better.

Hon. James F. Carey of Massachusetts, in "The Child Labor Evil," says a word for his state:

"Hundreds of small boys work for Mr. Borden (Fall River, Mass.) and many of them toil ten hours a day without a thread of clothing on their bodies. No one except employes is allowed to enter the works, and therefore when it was stated before a woman's club in New York, last week, that naked babies were at work in the Fall River mills, much interest was aroused. . . .

"They work in the big tanks called 'lime keers,' in the bleach house, packing the cloth into the vats.

"This lime keer holds 750 pieces of cloth, and it requires one hour and twenty minutes to fill it. During that time the lad must work inside, while his body is being soaked with whatever there is of chemicals which enter into the process of bleaching, of which lime is a prominent factor.

"The naked bodies of the children who do this work day after day are never dry, and the same chemicals which effect the bleaching process of the gray cloth naturally bleaches the skin of the operator, and after coming out of the vats the boys show the effects in the whiteness of their skins, which rivals the cotton cloth."

This, like that in Chicago, is a fair capitalistic sample of benevolently assimilating childhood to its future function in society—the making of dividends for stockholders.

If one of these daily bleached little wretches should turn out to be a tramp or an anarchist, what a case of falling from grace, or what an evidence of inbred depravity it would furnish the capitalistic moralist.

Gibson Gardner reports a Washington, D. C. judge of a United States court as saying: "It is impossible to have a perfect system. Somebody will always suffer injustice. Somebody has got to be ground in the mud." Yes, while the system of industry that he advocates obtains, "grinding in the mud," at the loom, in the coal chute, in the vats, and in the sweatshops is the regular order. But American manhood is awakening, Judge, and the time comes apace when, if it is necessary to do any grinding, it will not be the women and children that will be under the stones.

The difficulty in securing enactment and enforcement of a law governing the labor of women and children arises from its inconsistency with the present system of industry. In the first place, so far as such legislation relates to women, it is at variance with that modern myth known as "the right of free contract." This has come to mean the right of the capitalist to formulate the contract, and the right of the laborer to sign it if he is so fortunate as to get an opportunity. This myth still has orthodox adherents among the judiciary who conveniently find authority for the tenet in that obsolete and very elastic document known as our Constitution. For this reason such laws are commonly consigned to the unconstitutional scrap heap. Secondly, labor-power is a commodity; and such enactments interfere with one's right to purchase where he can do so most cheaply and, therefore, they diminish the annual returns of the would-be purchaser. Thirdly, they cannot reveal the truth about

a child's age and, as a consequence, they give rise to a fertile and extensive source of perjury, lying and misrepresentation—corruption—such as characterize the whole capitalist system. Let it be in mercy (and in truth) said that doubtless in a great majority of cases, as far as concerns the untruthful statements of mother and child, they are justified on the grounds of acting under duress. When necessity presses with sufficient rigor, a false statement, like the one uttered by the nun in defense of Jean Valjean, is registered to their credit in heaven. It is a notorious fact that where these laws are "enforced" there is a dearth of children whose "ages" are within three years of the legal limit. Fourthly, the United States cannot enact a labor law of universal application; therefore the various states must act independently. If, therefore, in one or more states, the purchasers of labor-power are permitted to buy in a cheaper market than are those of another or other states, the dealers in the cheaper market have a very decisive economic advantage over their more unfortunate competitors elsewhere. In fact, in some states the absence of restrictive labor legislation is held out as an inducement to would-be investors in mills, factories, etc. "Excellent opportunities for investment; children are plentiful and cheap"—is, at least by implication, an advertisement that brings many a dollar per letter. Under the stimulus of such "opportunities" the dividends of the owners of the southern cotton mills are becoming the envy of the northern manufacturers. The inequalities in economic conditions due to these state enactments supply a most potent argument against such legislation and an equally powerful preventative of its enforcement where such law has been enacted. Were it not for the vigilance of the labor unions,

such laws would everywhere be as dead a set of enactments as ever graced the statutes of any country in the world. Until labor in the South is aroused and organized, anti-child-labor laws might as well be left off the books. If the goodly disposed people down there think they can long defeat the purposes of the exploiters backed by their political machine, they have something to learn about practical politics.

If cruelty and legalized murder were the only evils consequent upon the enslavement of women and children, it might go on indefinitely. Life is cheap, dividends are precious and labor is prolific. That capitalistic monster greed might batten upon childhood and womanhood for generations and the supply still be equal to the demand. The murderous cruelty, the horror of the thing would put to shame any race of savages of whom we have any record; but the pious plutocrat who gloats over possessions sweated and distilled out of the very life's blood of child and woman,* like the privileged of all ages, "has no conscience on the subject of his privilege." He does not

*"But the evil (sweatshop) is so extensive and so difficult to reach that the ordinary factory inspectors are plainly unable to cope with it; about 160,000 persons are in the industry (clothing), of whom 70% are on contract work, the only limit to their hours of toil being the limit of endurance. No other class of laborers is so desperately situated, owing to the difficulty of introducing reforms in the numerous small places abounding in the dark corners of the great cities, the helplessness of the victims and the ignorant tenacity with which they cling to their tasks. It seems as though its victims are grasping at a chance to preserve life for the time being at any cost."—U. S. Labor Commissioner Carroll D. Wright, in *Bulletin of Labor*, May, 1896.

The veteran contributor, Bill Arp, of *Atlanta Constitution* fame, told us, some time in the '80's, of an evening spent in a northern city, where at least \$25,000 was squandered on a good time. In his excellent description of that social function he said (in substance) that in the midst of the revelry, there came to him this

see the women suffer and the babies die. Their cries never reach his ear. If he offers excuse or defense for his conduct, he pleads justification on two grounds: First, he is not personally responsible for such conditions as now obtain. They are universal in Christendom and he cannot obviate them. Second, he is in a competitive system of industry and is as helpless to thwart its merciless laws as is chaff to stay a whirlwind. Others take advantage of open conditions; he must do so or economically perish. And this is true. No matter what his individual conscience, his class is conscienceless. If his competitor, through a manager who must report progress, employs attractive young women at \$3 per week who are assumed to look to "gentlemen" friends to supply the deficit in funds, his own manager (or himself) must possess sufficient business acumen to meet the sharp practices of the competitor or lose his job. And so the merciless system grinds on, and, so long as it obtains, can no more check its own deadly work than can a rolling Juggernaut.

But cruelty and legalized murder are by no means the full measure of the awful results of this blight upon so-called civilization. If the institutions of our social and political—governmental—organization are not such as to train our people for participation as members of that organization; if through the medium of our institutions we fail to qualify our people for citizenship, we fail in the

thought: "It is one o'clock. Within a half-mile radius of this place, there are at this hour thousands of women making shirts at six cents apiece; and of my own personal knowledge I know that every cent of that \$25,000 was earned by the labor of their fingers."

Arp, in common with most Americans of that day, knew not what to do about the matter of such slavery and legalized robbery as he therein instanced. Perhaps he never learned: but America is learning, learning fast.

most essential function of organized society.* On this statement of truth the thoughtful are agreed; and what a condemnation of capitalism is voiced in that agreement.

Qualification for citizenship means something besides having spent the first twenty-one years of one's life within the United States. It means the physical strength, manual skill, mental discipline and general knowledge that alone can characterize a properly developed manhood or womanhood.

Measured by such a standard—and no people in this age of the world who lay any claim to being civilized should tolerate any other—the shortcomings of our own institutions are truly appalling.

The larger per cent, the governing majority so far as voting determines the course and character of government, receive practically no sort of training beyond the age of eleven or twelve years, except such as may be gleaned from the street, the factory, the mine, the sweatshop or other infernos of capitalism. As for mental discipline, it has not been carried through the memorizing period; on general knowledge, their minds are a blank; physically, when we have excepted the agricultural laborers, they are wrecks; manual skill, few indeed possess it. Even in craft training they learn to do things like an automaton—they become simply a part of a machine—and any unfortunate circumstance that disqualifies them for that particular function leaves them helpless and dependent. No general knowledge of mechanics,

* Commenting upon a committee's report showing an astonishing percentage of Britons who could not qualify as recruits for the South African army, England's premier said to his parliament that a government that failed in developing a strong physical as well as mental manhood, failed in the most essential thing for which governments are established among men.

physics, mathematics, or of anything else—not even of the use of tools—is theirs. Nor can this knowledge be gained except through self-directed effort on the part of one who is by toil already physically disqualified for any sort of exertion, and in whom the mental training is so defective that the sources of, or even the existence of knowledge beyond his immediate sphere of action is as shadowy a dream as the goblins of the nether world. And this is capitalism at its best.

Now go to the southern cotton mills and tell us how many of those thousands of little boys and girls can ever qualify for anything that savors of real manhood, womanhood, motherhood, citizenship or for anything else but a capitalistic slave-pen or a pauper's grave. And then go North and apply the same test. "How many children, Mr. Payson, are doing their day's work in your New Jersey factories? I have seen them—crawling to the shops in the early morning. There's no play time for them. But you need the money. . . . I'd ask no hotter hell for you and your wife than to have your own children sold to the same job—with the same food and wages, the same work and the same hours."*

There are now almost if not quite a hundred thousand little girls in a *single industry*—the textile mills—of this nation and the number is on the increase. These are destined not only to slavery blacker than ever before fell to the lot of mortals—for the chattel slave owner could ill afford such waste of property—but disqualified for every proper function of womanhood—a damning blight that should bring the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah upon any nation that permits such a thing even for an hour. And

* Mitchell: "The Silent War," page 132.

all this is but a tithe of our sacrifice for fine mansions, yachts, automobiles, "smart sets," "society," foreign dudes, millionaires—a plutocratic aristocracy.

And Pennsylvania, that grand old commonwealth, with untold store of what should be blessings, fosters a boyhood and a manhood in numbers sufficient to hold the balance of power in determining a national policy, not one per cent of whom can ever qualify for the duties of American citizenship; destined to slavery, ignorance, vice, crime, and the transmission of disease and deformity to future generations. And Pennsylvania's compensation for such sacrifice of boyhood and manhood, what is it? Pittsburgh's millionaire clubs with their regular grist of social scandals and divorces; an array of cities whose corrupt governments are the world-wide envy of the professional grafter; a railway system the most brazenly vile on the face of earth; a state government that would shame the imps of darkness.

Greater New York city boasts of her millions of humanity when, in present conditions, two-thirds of them stand about as much of a chance to qualify for citizenship under a civilized standard as do the beasts of the jungle. And the same is true of all large cities.

The wonder is not that evil is rampant; but rather that it has not long since swamped all that is good in human institutions. It has not done so and therefore the capitalist apologists tell us the good outweighs the evil. Yes, good outweighs evil as gold, volume for volume, outweighs feathers. But the claims of the apologists are not true. The sum total of good does not outweigh the sum total of evil, far, far from it. The influence of the non-vicious, the non-openly criminal, and the conservative, backed by the organized powers of government, exceeds

that of the vicious, beastly criminal and destructive; but this classification falls far short of following right lines of demarcation between the good and the evil in our social, political, and industrial organism. In the classification of these apologists we find the prevailing system of labor exploitation lined up with the good and even a note of emphasis attached telling of our righteous stewardship of wealth divinely bestowed upon the chosen. Confronted by such a premise—by such a conception of right and wrong, of good and evil—it is not worth while to investigate their conclusions. Their code of ethics might serve the lower grades of savagery, but even a semi-enlightened barbarism would spurn it, were its people free to do so.

The question as to what should be the function of the state in dealing with children is now upon us. Capitalism says: "We offer through our public school system—primary, grammar grade, high school and university—an opportunity for every child to obtain an education. What more do you ask?" We answer: "We ask just enough to inject into your declaration a meaning consistent with the words and to substitute truth for its falsity. Your system in no wise offers what you claim for it."

The claims of capitalism regarding proffered opportunities are at par with the system generally. It is rotten to the core and consistent in its rottenness. To say that every American child has opportunity for an education is quite as absurd as to say that each has an opportunity to be president—the euphonious construction of a deceptive lie—the statement of a physical impossibility.

In the first place, the capitalist system of robbing producers renders impossible the withstanding of ex-

pense necessary to take advantage even of our "free school system." The defenders of an industrial system that forces the whole family into the ranks of bread winners in order that they live and the exploiters thrive are playing upon fancy or falsehood when they prate of opportunities for those workers to be anything but slaves; and, so far as capitalism is concerned, there is no need for their being anything else. Capitalism must supply such a degree of education as will keep its labor market stocked to the required number and of requisite skill—a regular part of the cost of reproducing labor-power; but beyond that, 'twere better not to educate—safer for capitalism, better for the more skilled laborers. Then the children of tens of thousands of mothers who toil in factories and sweat shops—who will keep them in school or anywhere else that childhood's hours should be spent? Where grammar and high school courses are abridged in order to make possible a sort of graduation for a few before the girls must break for the factory and the boys for who knows where?—what must be the "education" of the millions of wretchedly poor, or of unskilled workers generally, who can never or seldom see the inside of a high school?

In the second place, what is the nature of the "education" that is proffered even for those who can avail themselves of it? The author has spent twenty-five years of his life in educational work, fifteen of them in the high school department. He is, therefore, by no means a stranger to the matter in hand. Education should be, as previously stated, a training of the mental, physical, manual and moral powers. As it is, the element of utility, except for the professions, is almost wholly submerged and, in some "aristocratic" quarters, actually

tabooed. There is little in such "education" that attracts him who knows that he is doomed to go out into that capitalistic hell known as the labor market and "rustle a living."

"Do you mean to say that every boy and girl should have a university education?" If you mean by a university education a long, laborious, thorough drilling in languages, literature, history, mathematics and science with the object in view of taking a degree, we answer, certainly not. You can't put two gallons of water in a quart jug, because the water is incompressible and the jug is not of sufficient capacity. But it will hold a quart and that much should go into it. There is not a sane child in our land who is not fully capable of being trained to perform intelligently a useful, necessary function in our social and industrial organism, not one. That training to his fullest capacity, should be his birthright; and not parent, guardian nor earthly thing should be permitted to abridge that right to the slightest degree. That much for every child, Socialism would have to do in order to be consistent; for in such a system, each is made wholly dependent upon his individual effort and it is to the interest of all that that effort be well directed and effective. Upon such direction and effectiveness would depend the social product of labor and consequently the returns for labor generally. The less waste, the better for all; for waste in any system is an expense that productive labor must meet. In capitalism, a waste is a good thing as it provides more opportunity for the producers to live—more jobs; in Socialism, as all would be producers, it would be a universal loss, except wherein the individual wasted his own returns.

"Then, in Socialism, if parents were indisposed to have

their children trained and educated or were disqualified to care for children, were unfit to rear them, you would take them away and place them under care of the State?" Well, if a child were in danger, you would not stop to ascertain before rendering the needed assistance whether the parent really cared to have that child rescued; and, furthermore, you would not deal very gently with the parent who attempted to interfere in any manner with your work as a rescuer. The interests of the child would be your only consideration. You would do more; you would even slay the parent were it necessary to save the child; that is, you would if you are just and humane. If Socialism were established tomorrow, its heritage from capitalism would necessitate the State's taking in charge a great many of the children of capitalistic wrecks; yes, and even the wrecks themselves as well as their offspring. Among these temporary burdens would necessarily be the male and female members of the "smart sets" of our great cities, "society" functionaries and all the expensive dudes in whom they invest. Humanity would demand that they be taken tenderly and taught how to be of some service to themselves and mankind. They would have to be taught how to make a living, for that they would have to do as soon as they could learn how. And it would be the greatest blessing that could be bestowed upon them this side of heaven. "But this would be expensive." Probably not one-tenth of one per cent as expensive as they now are and productive labor supports them without a protest. Remember they live from the \$8 worth. An inconsiderable fraction of that amount would meet all requirements. Of course they would be barred from paying hundreds of dollars for worthless terriers and poodles while babies are starving in the next block; but, in the

end, it would all prove better for them, for the babes, and even for the curs. Be that as it may, a very few years of Socialism would relieve society of all such burdens and of all necessity for action that even savored of charity or compulsion.

This problem of enslaved women and children in sweat-shop and factory and mine has its sole basis in profit. Its attendant vice, misery, degradation and destruction of life is a sacrifice to mammon. If heathen institutions anywhere on earth were offering one human sacrifice to our fifty, righteous horror and indignation would thrill all Christendom and missionary funds would swell the contribution boxes to bursting. But this is going on right in our midst, a regular factor in the production of millionaires. Our mammon worshipers donate a trifle for charity and piously fold their hands and murmur: "We can't help it. 'The poor you have always with you.' Divine wisdom has bestowed the wealth of the nation into our keeping and control. We are the fittest and hence survive. The dying babes and their slave mothers and fathers are unfortunate. They should be more economical." And then they go to take their bull-dogs out for an airing or to squander a fortune in launching some pampered darling on the road to matrimony, or a thousand fortunes to purchase her a foreign prince. And laborers, in their ignorance, supply these funds; thus corrupting the exploiter and enslaving themselves.

The nation's sources of subsistence are private property—utilized solely for profit. The owners must buy the commodity labor-power. Women and children supply a cheaper, greater-profit-yielding brand than do men. Therefore, theirs is in demand. And thus chained to the chariot wheels of this hideous god Mammon, they are dragged to their doom. And so they will go until this

merciless, insatiable, monstrous system of greed called capitalism has ceased to be a human institution—until the sources of life are collectively owned. If there is not an economic class struggle on in this nation, one is certainly coming and has already been mercilessly delayed. For the thought that American manhood will much longer tolerate such conditions as now obtain is too gross, too inconsistent, too greatly at variance with our traditions and our spirit of progressiveness to find lodgment in any thoughtful brain.

X.

DEGENERACY

There is a wealth of truth suggested by that epigrammatic couplet of Goldsmith's:

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

Among the pages of history upon which the student dwells long and attentively are those that depict the decay of institutions and peoples. The occurrence of a great nation's moving slowly but surely, or rushing hurriedly, madly to its own certain undoing is one that merits a thoughtful analysis. And if that nation be our own, if our living selves are being swept along in that ill-fated current, our analysis ends in an urgent call to action whose incentive is nothing short of self-preservation.

From the history of the past we learn to interpret the present and thence to prognosticate the future. We determine the course that we are now pursuing and that to which, if long continued, it must inevitably lead.

In the story of the ancient nations we learn that degeneracy and decay are the certain heritage of a people as soon as, from any cause whatsoever, the nation's wealth begins to concentrate as the possession of a few. Draper tells us that "the ruin of Rome was accomplished before the barbarians touched it."* Judge Story but echoes the universal voice of authority when he declares that "a mortal disease was upon her vitals before Cæsar had crossed the Rubicon"; and the germs of that disease were incubated in the cesspool of wealth concentration. No nation can long endure as the possession of a small fraction of its citizens. That condition means a dominant plutocracy and a mass of subordinates, underlings, dependents and slaves. There is not an element of endurance, strength or stability in either of these classes. As the wealth of a nation is sweated into few hands, the vital, enduring, progressive qualities of that people are benumbed and deadened. Decay and death are as sure as time.

The conditions regularly and naturally attendant upon the amassing of great fortunes are incompatible with the building of such a manhood as that in which potent national and individual qualities are vested. We have already seen how corruption that is doing such deadly work along so many lines is a natural product of the institutions through which vast fortunes are accumulated. And this corruption reads degeneracy in every being poisoned by its venom. A people that will tolerate the placing, through the medium of a political machine or otherwise, of delegated authority upon an auction block, are not very far from the level of that block themselves. And it matters not whether the bid offered and accepted is a contribution to a state campaign

* Draper: "Intellectual Development of Europe," Vol. I, page 255.

fund in exchange for a senatorial toga, or assurance of service acceptable to a corporation in return for official position of any degree, high or low. Corruption spells degeneracy, and every instance of it previously cited could with perfect propriety be written under the title of this chapter.

Our boasted stewardship of wealth, typified in donations to or in construction of great institutions of learning, is but a mockery of enduring, ennobling national qualities when those "gifts" are a drain upon the vital forces of a great mass barred from those institutions as from the council chambers of an obligarchy.

Again, the enervation, the degeneracy resulting from fitful, uncertain employment in such proportions as now obtain among our people is in itself a mortal virus that will work havoc upon a nation in, historically speaking, a very short time. A few inventors, authors, scientists, scholars, and patriots, shining examples though they may be, do not constitute a nation. They may qualify as pilots, but without competent seamen the ship is destined for the shoals.

The vagrant, the tramp, the sweatshop denizens, the slum are but the slough of the unemployed army; these are the millions upon whom degeneracy is fast making or has made its final imprint. When a boy or man begs his first meal, whether it be at your back door, in the bread line or at "charity's" soup house, he has well nigh, if not wholly, ceased to be a considerable element in aught except a nation's decay. The hundreds of thousands of children who drag weary feet to and from the slave pens of our industries are fast qualifying for entry into that vast class whose ambition of old was sated by "bread and circuses."

In the early days of this Republic, this was a nation of homes. These were rural homes and had been hewn out of nature. They were not the abodes of luxury or of what is

commonly known as refinement; but each was peopled by a father, a mother and their loved ones and was owned by the occupants. These occupants did not don swallow-tailed coats and semi-waistless dresses when they gathered around the evening meal; but they earned what they wore and what they ate. They discussed various topics with a degree of ignorance that was rather broad and comprehensive; but all that was said and done evinced a wholesouled honesty and manliness. There was no semblance of the deceit, hypocrisy, jealousy and dissimulation that characterizes the full dressed (or half-dressed) banqueters. Life was real and wore its heart upon its sleeve; and the cares for the morrow excited neither anxiety nor pangs of conscience. The widow's sons might find it necessary to hunt 'coons in order to meet payment of taxes; but there were no visions of a heartless, evicting landlord to poison the day and "murder sleep."

Humble homes, these, but they produced a manhood glorified by contrast with its disinherited progeny. These homes are gone and their return is as impossible as is that of the conditions of which they were typical. They have been garnered by the exploiters or deserted for the industrial centers. Paradoxical as it may seem, progress demanded their destruction and forbids a return to such as they, yet degeneracy has marked the course of their disappearance at every step and set its stamp upon millions that the changing, increasingly progressive conditions have evicted. Our methods of industry have completely outgrown all such institutions as these early homes. Progressive, relentless, merciless capitalism has destroyed them, and installed in their stead the indifferent, shiftless, thrifless tenant—in some instances concentrating their ownership into large holdings, in others, sending the now well-to-do owners

into the gayer, more attractive and rapid life of the city, and their sons and daughters into the mills of industry. In either instance, a renter was substituted for the old home dwellers. This is true of almost half (more than 48%) of the farms of the nation and those that are not in tenantry are encumbered by more than a billion dollars in mortgages.

The cry of "back to the country life" raised by a few who fain would check the inevitable trend of events is as futile as an attempt to lengthen the day by staying the hand upon the dial. The city, the factory, the mill, the mine has them and upon them these are doing their deadly work. This they will continue to do as long as industries are but mediums of exploitation. There is nothing inherently depraving in city life, nor in labor in any form of factory, mine or mill; there is no essential reason for an exodus to the country and an attempt to reinstate obsolete conditions, except the retention of the power of the exploiter; but there is an inherent depraving force in a system of industry—of ownership—that converts our cities into jungles of vice, crime and corruption and our factories, mills and mines into slave dens.

The evolutionary industrial forces of the last century that wrought our developed industries made the massing of humanity an economic necessity; and before economic necessity, human institutions are swept as chaff before a gale. Capitalism, with all its absurdities, its cruelties, its tyranny, not only marks the most marvelously progressive period of human history, but every phase of it from the enslaving of the child to the making of the billionaire, has been an essential step along the highway of progress. It is a light task for us to look into the past and point out wherein greater good would have resulted and greater heights have been attained if a different course had been chosen at various

points along that highway. We can easily discern, for instance, that it would have been far better for the nation to have purchased the freedom of the black slave with money than with blood; but prior to the war, there was no time when the owners of those slaves—the then dominant power in the government—could comprehend that their economic interests lay in any such line of action. Their interpretation of their own interests made necessary every step taken to maintain, extend and perpetuate their “sacred institution”; and, likewise, the counter interpretation of the economic interests of those of the North made necessary every step taken to overthrow that “sacred” thing when it had outlived its usefulness—had become obsolete. When we talk of what should have been done or what would have been done if men had only been wise and good, we are dealing with, or rather speculating about ethereal, ideal beings such as we ourselves are not, and not with men with feet upon the earth, real beings as we are—thoughtless, indifferent, inert, followers of the lines of least resistance, moving only as immediate conditions compel. So the exploiters of labor today—the dominant power in government—read (rightly or wrongly, it matters not) their economic interests in the retention of every institution of capitalism—enslaved child, woman and all—and these they will entrench, extend and perpetuate until exploited humanity shall discern wherein lies its economic interests and takes such steps as are necessary to end the dominance of the exploiters both in government and in industry. We may then prattle about what should have been, but when we have analyzed conditions and humanity as they now are, it will be found that despite all seemingly unaccountable conduct on our part, despite all the cruelty and injustice that we tolerate, there is a consistency in it all, it is all necessary to

the next step in advancement, we are very much like our predecessors.

The degeneracy wrought through the institutions of capitalism upon the lowly is not more marked or thorough than is the deterioration among their rich contemporaries. Except in this, that poverty's victims are far more numerous than are the progeny of affluence, there is slight difference in the baleful effects of the antipodal environments into which each is cast. The one suffers from penury, the other from superabundance; the one from inanition, the other from repletion; the one from lack of necessities, the other from surfeit of the unnecessary; the one from over work, the other from over idleness. Opposite as are the conditions into which each is thrust, the results are alike—depletion of the vital powers and submergence of the qualities that constitute a well rounded manhood or womanhood.

In fact in many particulars, the havoc wrought by the unreasonable, artificial conditions to which humanity is now subjected is greater among the rich than among the poor. For whatever may be the suffering, the anguish of poverty, however it may shatter the spirit and blight the lives of those upon whom it rests, it at least leaves them possessed of qualities and of knowledge necessary to a condition of self-dependence. They have been in life's combat; they have learned the meaning of self-preservation. But among all classes of humanity there is no other that, as a whole, would be more helpless, more a prey to circumstances, more unfit to survive than would be the rich, if thrust upon their individual merits and resources into the real, great capitalistic world of today, into the jungle of human life.

With no serious thought of the morrow, with no sense of responsibility, with unlimited means and no thought or care as to how or by whom those means were created, their

entry into the gay, fast life is a matter practically beyond their control. With them it is all play and no work. Their most strenuous effort is a search for variety in entertainment. Excesses, dissipation, non-conventionality follow such an existence as effect follows cause. The power and influence of their dollars not only smothers expression of merited criticism or censure but renders them indifferent to it. They seek only the approbation and applause of their own "set" and they are schooled in its ethical standards—or lack of standards. No other life could be more unreal, unnatural, insipid, void of all ennobling qualities than that into which they are plunged. Jealousy, envy, bitterness, backbiting characterize their conversation and deportment to a degree that nauseates intelligence and engulfs them all in a life of misery and simulation.

If the evil consequent upon such worthless lives spent its whole force upon those with whom it is initiated, concern, solicitude, or regret would be far from universal; but like a virulent contagion it spreads among aping tens, hundreds, thousands everywhere and becomes a source of national degeneracy of momentous proportions. That among such a spendthrift, pleasure seeking, money mad, plutocratic "aristocracy," marriages based on expediency and their consequent "free love" and divorces should so largely predominate is in accord with human nature. The body may for a time be held in subjection to a contract that consolidates large fortunes, but the soul will seek its affinity and finally assert itself.

Possessed of unlimited means and constantly subjected to every form of temptation to exercise the power vested in those means, and this, too, after a few years of wild-oat sowing on a practically unlimited field, few indeed there are among the scions of wealth upon whom the marriage vow

can rest with due restraining force. On this phase of debasement of the "higher life," read a word from Upton Sinclair: "But Montague was familiar with the saying, that if you follow the chain of the slave, you will find the other end about the wrist of the master; and he discovered that the Tenderloin was wreaking its vengeance upon Fifth avenue. It was not merely that the men of wealth were carrying to their wives and children the diseases of vice; they were carrying also the manners and the ideals." . . . "Smoking and drinking and gambling of women, their hard and cynical views of life, their continual telling of coarse stories." And then to sum it all up, he says: "No wrong which they could do to the world would ever equal the wrong which the world has done to them, in permitting them to have money which they had not earned."

And thus we have it that this appalling nation-wide degeneracy is wrought at one extreme among the enslaved, exploited producers of fortunes and at the other extreme among those who possess them. Nor is any intermediate class of our people exempt from the consequent degradation of this capitalist system of industry, for as has already been intimated, the problems of corruption, unemployment, slavery of men, women and children, and of the liquor traffic are but some of the tributaries of this one.

In the light of facts, even superficially viewed, how evident it becomes that what we term morality, and our whole code of ethics, has an economic basis. How could such a code be pure or wholesome resting as it does and as do our ideas of proper relations between human beings—of right and wrong—upon such an infamy as the exploitation of human labor?

These great wrongs, born of this industrial system, will disappear with the system; but not while that obtains. As

long as that \$8 worth (or whatever it may be in exact figures) passes from the producer into the hands of the exploiter, its consequent curses are upon us. Therefore we demand the collective ownership of the sources of life, the complete substitution of a co-operative system of industry for this vice-breeding system of capitalism.

XI.

INDUSTRIAL WARS.

As has already been shown, since the advent of labor-displacing machines, capitalism has to a greater or less degree been constantly menaced by an unemployed army among the working class. Attention has previously been called to various circumstances that have in the past sufficed to prevent that problem's reaching such a stage of acuteness as makes revolution in industrial methods a necessity. Chief among these vents to the labor market were found the industries made possible or greatly extended in scope by the use of machinery, new industries for supplying the needed machinery, and the vast undeveloped continent to which the surplus laborers immigrated.

As long as these new fields served to absorb the displaced laborers to such a degree as to prevent a competition among the sellers of labor-power that was destructive of such a standard of living as was satisfactory to laborers generally, such as appealed to them as consistent with prevailing conditions, no occasion existed for drastic measures on the part of laborers to acquire or maintain what they call "a fair day's wage for a fair day's work." But with the changing conditions of developing capitalism, with the diminish-

ing opportunity to "go west and grow up with the country," with the relatively decreasing demand for extension of machinery, factories, railroads, etc., labor soon faced the necessity for organized action along lines of self-defense. What they really faced was necessity for entry into the most momentous class struggle of history; but their vision was far too limited to comprehend a proposition of such proportions as that presents. They were formally taking the initial steps in a world wide industrial revolution; they thought they were simply forming craftsmen of every trade into labor unions.

Unions in some crafts have existed in this country from early times, but nation-wide unionism, embracing every craft from boot-blacks to the most highly skilled workmen is a very modern institution and is as unqualifiedly a product of industrial conditions as is the millionaire. Developing capitalism forced it into being just as it separated the users of the machinery of production from the ownership of the machines.

The objects for which labor unions are formed are various, but they are all minor in comparison with and subordinate to the one supreme purpose—to maintain a standard of living, to keep up wages, *to control the price of the commodity labor-power*. To accomplish this purpose, an organization based on monopolistic principles is a prime requisite. And the strength and effectiveness of any union (in the craft form of unionism) is directly proportional to the degree of its monopolization of the available labor-power in that particular craft. Unless a union can effect to a considerable degree a monopolistic control of the labor market, it has but things of minor import for which to live.

But despite the pressure of circumstances, many laboring men do not comprehend the necessity for organization,

much less the causes that breed that necessity. Therefore attempt is often made to offset or neutralize the effects of this lack of comprehension through measures more or less coercive. Chief among these measures is objection on the part of the union men to working with those who refuse to assist in the struggle for the betterment of the conditions of all.

These coercive measures are very naturally a source of bitter strife and contention among the laborers themselves. Nor should this excite our wonderment. When we recall the primal object for which unions are formed and then find that the most potent obstacle to their successful operation is the non-comprehension or indifference of laborers, it is not a surprising thing that exasperation expresses itself in terms of compulsion.

The bitterness manifested by union men toward those of their class who refuse to join with them is not an inherent characteristic of unionism, but rather a manifestation of the outcropping of human nature under stress of circumstances. Since economic conditions began to force capitalists into organizations for self and mutual protection, the industrial highway has been strewn with wrecks of luckless wretches of that class who imagined they could "paddle their own canoes" against any current set in motion by the combines. They were "absorbed," or crushed and put out of the way without the privilege even of the repentant. The difference between the two processes of coercion is this: In the case of a union, coercion necessarily manifests itself against groups and in the open. It is therefore conspicuous, and the capitalists' press is a convenient medium for exploiting its odious features. In case of the capitalists, the coercing force is directed in secret and against isolated individuals. They "fail in business" because they cannot stand "the pres-

sure of legitimate competition." The fact is, both have acted and still act under pressure of economic necessity; and that is a condition that is not likely to awaken the finer sensibilities of our natures, one in which humanity is not wholly swayed by conscientious scruples.

As unions gained in strength, the conditions that forced them into being unavoidably forced them into conflict with the exploiting employers. The relatively increasing number of wholly or partially unemployed intensified competition among sellers of labor-power and it is but natural that purchasers of that commodity should endeavor to take advantage of the condition of the market. The primal object of the union is to resist and if possible prevent such action as must result in lowering the laborer's standard of living. The struggle for supremacy was on—a struggle involving these diametrically opposite interests—a struggle in which each of the contending parties claims to be defending what of necessity is its rights.

Many circumstances have led to open hostility between laborers and capitalists and the number of persons directly involved have varied from a few individuals to hundreds of thousands. But when less than a half dozen causes are enumerated, all others are relatively of little importance. First, an attempt to reduce the standard of subsistence by lowering wages or increasing hours for the same wage, the cost of living remaining constant. Second. A reduction in the standard of living resulting from a general rise in the prices of food stuffs, wages remaining constant. In such instances, a refusal to increase wages is equivalent to a cut under former conditions. Third. An attempt on the part of the union to force a reduction in the number of hours that shall constitute a day's work either with or without a proportionate change in wages. Fourth. An attempt on

the part of one or more organizations to force recognition of the demands of some union through coercive measures brought to bear upon one or more employers in allied industries—through the sympathetic strike.

Through the years of developing capitalism, as the unions gradually grew in number and in strength, as the trusts formed and the organizations of capitalists were perfected, strikes increased in number from year to year until they averaged for twenty years (1880 to 1900) more than one thousand per annum.* These industrial wars not only increased in frequency but also in the number of laborers affected, in their period of duration and in intensity. They became in nature well nigh, if not quite, pitched battles; not between a group of laborers and an employer, but between organized laborers and organized capitalists. From mere local affairs, they grew to embrace in a single conflict from one to several states and even to involve a great part of the nation. All manner of industries were more or less affected; the coal mines, street railways, steel works, building trades, lumber camps, teaming, and railroads furnished the most conspicuous instances and involved the greatest number of men.

In these tremendous struggles between opposing economic forces, that laborers should be drawn into conflict with the organized powers of the government, both state and national, was inevitable. There are various reasons for this and they are conclusive:

First. The present system of industry—the wage system—is the regularly established order. It is entrenched in law both constitutional and statutory. It rests solely upon

*Labor Commissioner Carroll D. Wright in *North American Review*.

one basic principle—the right of private ownership of the sources of life-sustenance.

Second. As a corollary of this principle, and more, as a condition essential to it, there follows the right of the property owner to exploit the labor of the propertyless.

Third. This exploitation is possible only as long as labor-power is a commodity to be bought and sold in the market and on such terms as may be agreed upon between the buyer and the seller; hence the theory of “free contract.”

Fourth. As private property in our means of production is dependent upon exploitation of labor—is impossible without that right and privilege—it follows that any interference on the part of a third party that abridges the privilege of the buyer of labor-power to purchase as he sees fit and where he can purchase most cheaply, abridges his property rights—is confiscatory.

Fifth. As the foregoing are the industrial conditions that are entrenched in law—as they are the principles that governments are now organized to defend—it follows that labor unions are institutions that the industrial system does not warrant. They are incompatible with it; they are out-laws from their inception.

Sixth. Each laborer has the right in law to sell his labor-power when and where and on such terms as opportunity affords. This condition is essential to the exchange of labor-power at its commodity value and that method of exchange is essential to capitalism. In short, capitalism cannot tolerate a monopoly of the commodity labor-power in the hands of the commodity owners, the laborers; *for that is the commodity from which the owners of property must draw their entire sustenance.*

Seventh. Labor holds these conditions to be unjust and wholly intolerable. It demands a voice in determining

the value (or at least the price) of its commodity. Since this demand is essentially at variance with the fundamental principles of the system, is of necessity confiscatory, it cannot be granted. Therefore, the irrepressible conflict between exploited and exploiters, between laborers and capitalists.

Eighth. Out of these opposing interests grows the conflict into which the government's organized forces are drawn. Since the chiefest function of government is to maintain property rights, that is, to maintain the privilege of the exploiter, to uphold the present system of industry, it is impossible that its forces should be exerted in defense of those whose demands are incompatible with the system.

Ninth. The owning class is necessarily the ruling class—the dominant power in government—and no class will use its power to accomplish its own destruction, or in any manner to its own injury.

Here another point must not be overlooked. If the wage system is right, if it should be perpetuated, whatever measures may be necessary to maintain and perpetuate it are right. A measure that is necessary to sustain what is right, cannot be wrong. Likewise, a measure necessary to preserve a constitution or to uphold that which is constitutional cannot itself be unconstitutional. In contesting a disputable measure, or a questionable procedure, the only point at issue involves its necessity. There is no power granted by our national constitution for the issue of full legal tender paper money; but when in the early '60's, congress ordered and executed such an issue, the Supreme Court held that the measure was one necessary to the preservation of the government under the constitution and therefore could not be unconstitutional. Again, while slavery was a constitutionally established institution, no court governed by that

instrument could logically declare a statute unconstitutional nor a mode of procedure on the part of one or more persons as illegal, if it were apparent that the preservation of this institution—of owners' rights vested by it—was the question involved. Therefore the fugitive slave law withstood judicial scrutiny. A black slave was a constitutionally established chattel. When it became necessary to take the stand that he could not cease to be a chattel because of his being taken across the Ohio River or over some state boundary within the nation governed by that constitution, the Dred Scott decision was but a logical sequence.

Today the right of private property in the nation's sources of subsistence, that is, the right to exploit human labor, *the right of property in the labor of the wage worker*, is a constitutionally established institution. In fact, this is the institution that above all others it is the mission of that organic law to maintain. It follows, then, that no enactment nor no mode of procedure on the part of the capitalist class—the owners of this property—can be declared by a court basing its decision upon that constitution to be irregular or illegal if necessity for the preservation of these property rights can be shown. And at the expense of repetition, let it again be said, this property is not in material things; it is vested in the right to consume the commodity labor-power. And as necessity presses, we find that our courts come nearer and nearer to expressing their decisions in these terms, just as in ante-bellum days they faced the certain necessity to decide that slavery was a national and not a sectional institution—that Dred Scott was everywhere a slave.

Then it is not necessary (or soon it will not be) in case of a strike anywhere, that buildings, factories, mines or railways shall be menaced or injured in order that the strikers

shall be declared outlaws and the intervention of courts and militia invoked. The strikers may go away peacefully and refuse the use of their labor power; if it can be shown that their conduct in any manner is an infringement upon property rights, that it in any manner thwarts the purposes of this constitutional institution, they are breakers of law. And when it comes to the "Dred Scott" test of the wage system, it will be, it must be held that imprisonment in "bull-pens" without warrant or charge of criminality, deportation from home and state, or any other measure necessary to establish the owner's privilege to exploit on what is practically his own terms is legal and constitutional. For the same basic reason—"infringement upon property rights"—the boycott and a long series of attempted "labor legislation" have been declared criminal or relegated by our courts to the unconstitutional waste-basket.

Time was, in this nation, when if one form of chattel, a horse for instance, escaped across a state line and one should deprive it of food or water, he would be guilty of a misdemeanor; but if another form of chattel came along, a black man, and the one guilty of inhuman treatment of the horse should furnish sustenance for the slave, the donor would be guilty of a felony. The opponents of such legislation might cry "unreasonable," "unjust" or "inhuman"; it mattered not. Necessity for maintenance of an institution of privilege does not yield to qualms of conscience. On the contrary, the privileged bring into play their organized and armed powers to enforce their decrees. And that they will do as long as they are in command of the forces and vested with power to legislate.

Labor may cry out even in execration against the use of governmental forces to defeat its efforts to establish better conditions or secure justice for its membership; it may

anathematize judges and courts; it may flood legislatures and congresses with petitions and protests—but to no avail. The nature of the institution in which labor-power is such an essential factor has been made sufficiently clear. It is an institution of privilege upon whose marrowy bone (that \$8 worth) the iron jaws have closed and they will release only when broken. Labor must learn that as long as delegated governmental authority is lodged by labor's vote in capitalist officials, labor, in its fruitless contests with its employers, is but reaping the returns of its own folly.

And here it is not amiss to enter an earnest plea for patience on the part of those to whom has been given the power to comprehend the mission of "pure and simple" unionism with those barred by nature or by circumstances from understanding its apparently simple and essential purposes. Arguing from our original assumption, productive labor yields for the market \$10 worth per day. It gets as its share simply the cost of the reproduction of labor-power, the \$2 worth, and passes over to the exploiter the other \$8 worth. The "pure and simple" unionist sees far enough to comprehend that his share, whatever it may be, is not "a fair division" of the product. He demands, say, that he be given \$2.25 per day or, at least, that the \$2 worth shall not be reduced; and he grows impatient with his fellow laboring man who cannot see so simple a proposition or who neglects or refuses to yield to its seductive allurements. The trade unionist's conclusions appeal to himself as being so self-evidently logical and necessity for his action so just and imperative that he even refuses companionship or any sort of effort conjointly with the fellow who will not see and act with him. But when the Socialist enters the forum and presents to this same "pure and simple" unionist the proposition underlying this volume; shows him, or at least

tries to show him, the real meaning, the absurdity of his \$2.25 proposition; even demonstrates to him the real nature of the struggle in which each is playing a preliminary role; points the havoc wrought, the awful wrongs that accrue to his entire class by this "dividing up" process to which he has already too long submitted—when the Socialist presents his proposition, far more easy of comprehension for him who is subject to reason, and infinitely stronger as an appeal to his interests and the interests of his class and of humanity as a whole, this unionist rejects it with the insipid, thoughtless, foolish, unreasoned assertion that some species or other of capitalist political organization is good enough for him. He makes just the reply that his exploiting master would dictate were he asked to do so. If there is wisdom in patience, our "pure and simple" union brother might drink deep at the Socialist fountain.

The attitude of the great mass of organized labor in the United States toward Socialism presents to the superficial observer a historical anomaly. Here is a mighty mass of humanity that has so far emerged from the thralldom of mental slavery that it can supply on demand men qualified for any possible requirement of the most extensive and complex system of production of all history. It can furnish (or could easily do so if wage workers were fully organized) every being necessary to the carrying on of all the important industries in every detail from raw material to consumer. It is schooled in the processes of organized industry and it is the class and the only class that knows the details of that work. So much is this true, to such an extent is industry today in the hands of wage workers of all grades, that if every owner of the great concerns were to die within an hour and the matter of their taking off be kept a secret, industry would move on unconscious of the "calamity" that

had befallen it. The non-essentiality of bond and stock holders, of gamblers and speculators, of schemers and their raids to gain control, of voters and issuers of watered stocks and their criminal "business methods" in foisting them upon the people, of the whole round of endless, all-comprising, all-pervading plunder known as "business" is, with these workers, practically demonstrated. These workers know that industry is carried on independently of any function fulfilled by any or all of these non-essential so-called "business men," is carried on in large measure in spite of them; that of matters essential to real industry, this mass of exploiters are as ignorant as the grain gamblers are of agriculture. All this, to these organized workers, is common knowledge and, among the more intelligent of them, a matter of ordinary comment. Yet so intense is the spirit of fetich worship among hundreds of thousands of them that they seem to imagine that without these extraneous job-owners their jobs might cease to exist.

Again, these workers know that they are constantly being mercilessly exploited and from that consciousness they garner strength for the tremendous struggles with their employers. They buckle on their armor and put up such a fight for an increase in wage of a few cents a day as, if it were directed against the whole system of the exploiters, would shake that structure to its foundation. They will fight to starvation's door for 25 cents' worth more of their labor product and sneer at the brother who even calls attention to the greater sum exploited from the fruits of their toil; and then they assemble and repeat with solemn emphasis, "no wage can ever be a just reward for labor"—thereby admitting all that the Socialist claims.

They know that the propertyless of this nation must gain a livelihood in its industries; and they find those industries

involved in such a system that they are forced, on the ground of self-preservation, to limit apprenticeships and declare against trade schools—forced to adopt such measures as may deprive their own children of even such scant opportunity as is open to themselves. They realize something of the inability of capitalism to provide work for all; they have felt the blighting effect of intensified competition and shun it as a pestilence. They have full knowledge of how easily labor could supply every need of the nation could it but be properly organized; yet the suggestion of effort on their part to establish a system involving such organization, the suggestion of political action in the interests of their own class, excites thousands of them as might the presence of a Fury.

They know, or by this time should have learned, that much of what seems success upon their part in increasing their nominal wage (the dollars or cents that they get per day) is neutralized by the masters by their putting up the prices of the laborer's sustenance. In this manner of combating the unions' "success," the real wage (what the nominal wage will buy) is in some important instances actually lowered.* The whole matter reduces to this, that while labor-power can be reproduced upon one-fifth of labor's product.

* Omitting the relatively few and high salaried officials of our railways, the average wages paid all employes in 1895 was \$2.02 per day. Ten years later, 1905, this average was \$2.25 per day. These ten years, therefore, show an increase of eleven and one-third per cent. But during this same ten years, the official reports of our government show (and our own experience proves them true) that the price of labor's subsistence advanced almost double that per cent. The increase in wage was only apparent; the real wage was actually lowered.

By this process the unions would always be defeated and capitalists would be indifferent to union "successes" were it not that these increased prices excite opposition from a large and influential faction of the capitalist class themselves. As above indicated, this plan of warfare is resorted to, but capitalists do not court it. In earlier times when industry was not so fully organized

that is all there is in capitalism for the producer. No matter what move labor may make upon the industrial chess-board, capitalism is rich enough in resources to play a check-mating pawn.

Possessing the knowledge that is theirs—knowledge deduced, as it were, from decades of experimentation; absorbed as is their energy and thought in a conflict whose nature and final outcome are too apparent to admit of rational disputation, yet a large majority of organized labor, at this time, seem wholly oblivious of the part they are playing in the world's history. They seem utterly blind to the significance of events in which they themselves are among the chief actors.

But there is reason for their short-comings. While they are not illiterate, they are not educated except in the processes of production—in what they have to do. Of general knowledge they possess little; from reasoning on a broad plane, they are in large measure barred. In their own immediate welfare and concerns they have and they evince a lively interest; but the future is something afar off—they see it as through a glass dimly. Owing in large measure to early training (or lack of it) and wanting in the experience that certainly awaits them, hundreds of thousands of them live in the vain, delusive hope that somehow, somewhere, some time, like the lucky man in the lottery drawing, they will land on flowery beds of ease—will get some-

as now, it was not a practicable plan except in case of a quite general rise in wages. Competition among operators prevented its adoption by isolated manufacturers. It is apparent, however, that the practicability of this mode of procedure increases as capitalist organizations (especially trusts) are perfected. A rise in wages of workers in the oil industry would not long disturb the dividends of Standard Oil; nor would that combine give much heed to the opinion of other capitalists as to its mode of meeting the "oppression of unions."

thing for nothing and thus win promotion to the master class. A co-operative commonwealth does not, in their way of thinking, lie in the line of least resistance. It seems shadowy and afar off. But more than all else, they are utterly ignorant of what it means for them and their class and they are indifferent and indisposed to investigate the matter. They are content to eke out an existence and dream of impossible conquests as capitalists.

Despite all this they are gradually awakening. Under pressure of economic conditions they cannot continue indefinitely to slumber. Through the more intellectual and thoughtful of their membership the light is breaking upon all. In the council chamber of the union they are learning of the mission for which they are destined—learning the lesson of the class struggle.

Nor are they relatively more blind to the significance of passing events than are their masters. Immediate self-interest is a mighty factor in determining the course of the average individual, but a mind endowed with the power to reason from cause to effect, to generalize, cannot be wholly clouded by the influence of a few paltry dollars. The average so-called business man realizes as little beyond the narrow, insignificant sphere in which he operates as does the average wage worker. Inability to interpret contemporaneous history is alike a characteristic of all classes.

The industrial class struggle of the ages is on; all the years of strife between the employers and the employed is but one phase of it. Fundamentally it is a struggle for possession of the world's sources of subsistence. The basic question is, shall these be collectively owned and access to them be made free to all who desire to enjoy the things of life in proportion to his individual effort; or shall they remain the possession of a few and a medium for the exploita-

tion of the many? It is, in its last analysis, a struggle between the exploiting class and the exploited class. Conditions are so shaping that, historically speaking, it will not much longer be possible for both these classes to remain upon the industrial field. As the producing class is impossible of exclusion, it follows that the exploiting privilege must be abrogated. There is no alternative outcome of this world-wide movement, if civilization is to be perpetuated. While the exploiter is on the industrial field, he must be in command—he must dominate industry, he must dictate governmental policy. Clothed in the vestments of these powers, his privilege is secure. And it is to this fact that the unions, in common with the whole class of exploited humanity, are awakening.

Power, organized power—that is the requisite to the sustenance of privilege. Today that power is back of the exploiter and there it will remain until wrested from him. Under the constitution and laws of this nation as they are now formulated, the vesting of power is determined by the franchise of the people. Exploited humanity is learning that it has but to use that franchise and, if need be, compel obedience to law in order to clothe itself with authority to modify government in any particular or to any degree. At this stage of the contest, the use of the franchise by labor is the lesson of prime importance for it to learn. In the processes of acquiring such a schooling, in the initial steps of such a movement, one might logically expect the organized bodies, those who come together regularly in counsel, those who fight through long and bitter contests with the masters on the economic field, those who are really and actively in the struggle for the final emancipation of their class, not only to play a leading role in the great drama, but to initiate and lead, not follow. In this, however, as in all

great movements, the basic principles are too intricately involved in psychology, sociology and in historical deductions generally to emanate from other than intellectual sources above and beyond the mass of wage workers. But when the deductions have been formulated and the inevitable trend of events established beyond peradventure, when all this has been so simplified as are the principles of Socialism at this time, that these laborers must finally adopt and act upon them goes without saying.

As already stated, the means of conquest are vested by law in exploited humanity. Of this they are fast gaining knowledge and availing themselves of opportunity thus opened. But it must not be overlooked that capitalism is now in the saddle. It thrives upon the fruits of privilege; and privilege of such proportions that by comparison any other ever granted dwarfs into insignificance. Undeveloped capitalism established such a system of government as leaves open a channel through which the full-grown system may be legally assailed and overthrown—universal suffrage. When we recall the unconscionable methods to which classes in all ages have resorted to maintain privilege once conferred; when we consider the measures of disfranchisement already adopted and the constant tendency to encroach upon what now constitutes the people's liberty; when we take into reckoning the tremendousness of the stakes for which the political game is to be played, upon what can we base the hope that that channel, that avenue of attack will remain open?

Will capitalism submit to the operation of the laws that itself enacted? Will it leave vested in the people the rights that have been incorporated in our constitution and statutes? In free schools, free press, free speech, universal suffrage, a legal count of ballots cast and submission to the will of the

majority, is read the doom of capitalism—a revolution in industry by peaceful methods and wholly within the law in every detail. The spirit of labor will not always strive with capitalists upon the economic field; it will soon take up the peaceful, legal method of the ballot—provided that gateway to the citadel is not closed.

But exploited humanity is going to take that citadel. That is as certain as death. The capitalist system must go. Like the other problems that we have considered, this one of war between laborers and capitalists must be solved; and when it is solved there will be left no warring factions. No system of industry, no nation can indefinitely withstand such a constantly increasing strain as these upheavals embody. When the producing masses take a stand for the full social equivalent of labor's product instead of as now scattering their energies as a disorganized rabble or wasting them in endless and relatively fruitless effort to secure a mere fraction of what should be theirs, they are going to insist upon their rights and privileges as now guaranteed in constitution and law. This will pass the subsequent necessary mode of action on the part of labor up to the capitalists. If the capitalists persist in the policy of abridgement of liberty and refuse to submit to the consequences of legal processes, then labor is simply compelled to enforce the majority's decrees by such means as may be devised under stress of necessity. This consummation is devoutly not to be wished; but a deep-rooted and valuable privilege is not likely to be surrendered until all possible means for its retention are exhausted. Capitalism will probably be found as devoid of conscience and as indisposed to consider any interests except its own, as have been the privileged of all former time. Certainly its means for evasion of law are as varied as the days of the year. When these fail, they must set all law aside and openly crown autocracy.

Let it be hoped that these surmises will prove to be erroneous. Let us hope that capitalists themselves may be brought to see the inevitable outcome of our industrial conditions, to discern the course of civilization; and seeing this, they may realize the futility of attempts to stay the wheels of progress. The privileged in the past have never so discerned, or as least have uniformly refused to act as such discernment would dictate. But knowledge is now broader and deeper and more widely diffused than ever before. The spirit of fraternity, the certainty of the oneness of human blood is rapidly gaining ascendancy over the thought and conduct of men. A peaceful revolution is at least a possibility.

XII.

INTERNATIONAL WARS

It would be preposterous to deny that war has served a mighty purpose in the development, the evolution, of the human race. It is equally preposterous to claim that that institution will indefinitely continue to serve a like purpose.

The first tribe that used the bow-and-arrow were at once led into new lines of activity. These lines extended in many directions. They entered into sports, recreation, procurement of food, defense against enemies, methods of warfare and the handiwork of manufacture. Every new activity led to the discovery of previously unrevealed relations and therefore to new lines of thought. This in turn called for extension of vocabulary and that meant greater exactness and refinement of verbal expression. That instrument placed this fortunate tribe on an intellectual plane far above that of surrounding savages and rendered its users

in every sense the fittest to survive. The old foe so formidable in combat, dependent upon brute force or more obsolete methods, could no longer contest the field. And when this wonder-working device passed into the hands of neighboring tribes, the struggle over disputed territory—the struggle for existence—further developed the idea of organized effort, the mental traits of cunning, courage and strategy, the physical qualities of hardihood, endurance, and exactness and refinement in muscular action.

It must be kept in mind that development is dependent upon environment, ancestral and personal; or, as this is commonly worded, upon heredity and environment. Even a cursory view into the surroundings, the conditions of life among these early tribes, reveals them so barren of developing forces or elements, as compared with those in which we are engulfed, that, with strife and war eliminated, evolution would have been practically if not entirely impossible.

Every discovery, every invention, every improvement in mode or method of gaining a livelihood broadened environment, enriched it as a thought producer, called for new institutions and multiplied incentives to action. The effect of each of several of these inventions and discoveries was so revolutionary that it marks a distinct stage in racial development—for instance, the use of fire, the bow-and-arrow, the making of pottery, the domestication of animals, the growing of cereals, the smelting of iron ore, the use of an alphabet, etc. And this enriching of environment has not only been accumulative, but has progressed in geometrical ratio. The last hundred years has witnessed as extensive and as potent modifications as thousands of years of our earlier history produced. Consider, for instance, the effect of our system of government, our means of production, transportation and communication, and our public school system, elementary and restricted though it be.

The barren environment of the peoples of the past called for war as a factor in the development of the race. In earlier conditions it unquestionably was an uplifting force. So doubtless at one stage was cannibalism. It supplied food and entertainment for conquering heroes. It made men more determined, more guarded, more sagacious in attack and in defense. So unquestionably was chattel slavery. These institutions have each played their part. They have assisted in the general elevation of the race to a certain level—to a certain enrichment of environment. Beyond that point they were no longer elevating in character, but became as a clog on the wheels of progress—a force for reaction, for retrogression rather than advancement. One of them, cannibalism, had served its purpose and was suppressed as an institution long before the stage of civilization was reached. The second, chattel slavery, projected itself far into our civilized era, clinging at isolated points until the chariot had rolled even into the age of machinery.

These institutions have wrought their good and their evil and been relegated to the past along with theories of anthropology, cosmogony and the pantheon—all abandoned relicts of barbarism. Another still clings, dragging its deadly weight into an environment in which it should be as much out of place as an unbidden guest at a marriage feast, an environment that once enriched by a proper conception of justice would place it at par with cannibalism. That one institution—war—inherited through lineal descent from the remotest savagery is still with us.

And upon what does it thrive? What makes its retention possible, even imperative? No institution can stand alone, isolated from all others that constitute our social, industrial and governmental corporation. Each is intimately asso-

ciated with another or others; interdependence alone can sustain any one of them.

In the discussion of the other problems, that upon which war is contingent, has already been made sufficiently plain. Strike from the list of our necessities a market for the products of labor that the producers cannot buy, for produce that labor garners for the exploiters, and what cause is today left for war? The armies of the world now wander over the earth in quest of a single boon—market. Whether we find them in Turkestan or the Transvaal, in Egypt or India, in Morocco or the Philippines, in Cuba* or Korea, in China or Manchuria, market is the prize of the victor and its loss the humiliation of the vanquished.

Developing capitalism, what a panorama; increase in our power to produce, increase in capacity of labor-displacing machinery, increase in our surplus-product, increase in our army of unemployed, increase in necessity for foreign market, increase in Dreadnaughts, armies and enginery of war, increase in necessity for universal slaughter—what a sequence of circumstances; what an outcome of our wonder-working industrial mechanism!

Today the Christian nations of earth vie with each other in the number of death-dealing monsters they can put afloat

*The pretensions of capitalism that the war with Spain had a humanitarian basis are set at naught by Mr. Frederick Emory, chief of the United States Bureau of Foreign Commerce, in *The World's Work* for January, 1902, in which he tells us:

"Cuba was, in fact, a stumbling block, a constant menace to the southward movement of our trade. To free her from the Spanish incubus was, therefore, a commercial necessity for us, and as we became more and more keenly alive to the importance of extending our foreign commerce, the impatience of our business interests at such obstruction was waxing so strong that, even had there been no justifying cause of an emotional kind, such as the alleged enormities of Spanish rule or the destruction of the Maine, we would doubtless have taken steps in the end to abate with the strong hand what was seen to be an economic nuisance."

and in the hundreds of millions each can squander in effort to bluff its neighbors in any contemplated move to make way for disposition of more produce—all openly preparing for the world conflict that with one voice they proclaim awaits us.

Thousands are preaching that international disputes should be and could be settled by arbitration and that the nations should disarm. No greater folly is conceivable while capitalism is the order of industry. It is market that the United States *must have*, that England *must have*, that Germany *must have*, and so with Russia, Japan, France and even China. There is not enough of these coveted prizes for all—prizes that stand between “a nation’s industrial triumph” and starvation. In their quest not one of the Great Powers dares to trust the consequences of arbitration and disarmament—that is, the organized greed that dominates these Powers dares not so trust. An all-conquering navy alone can claim their confidence. These governments have no more confidence in each other than have so many professional thieves or competing bands of highwaymen. And practically that is about their proper designation. They are but the organized instruments of the money-mongers—devout disciples of that Jesuitical creed, “the end justifies the means.” The great exploiters of the various nations, the dominant power in each, the organized grafters of the world, have ambitions to gratify, want something that could not be obtained in the remotest realms of Justice; therefore, when opportunity affords (like England’s millionaires’ interests in South Africa) they “have nothing to arbitrate.” An army and navy is their sure reliance; and to make it doubly sure it must man the most Dreadnaughts.

The private ownership of our means of production, and international war, are now as inseparably linked as any two

institutions ever established by man. About the neck of industry hangs this monster of savage origin; and there it will hang until the institution, capitalism, from whose foul breast it draws its sustenance, has been purged from our enviroing elements as have been others that have served their usefulness.

Then Socialists would not go to war if it were declared? That depends on the cause. If our country were ruthlessly invaded (a circumstance well nigh beyond possibility), or if human rights or liberties were at stake (a circumstance not at all beyond possibility), the Socialist would step into the ranks and offer life if need be. But when called upon to slaughter his brothers and comrades in order to provide disposition for what this system of industry has compelled him to hand over to exploiting capitalists, he answers emphatically, NO. There is too much in life for him to sacrifice it for capitalism. He knows that if capitalists had to fight the wars of their own making, an ordinary French duel would be a sanguinary affair compared with all the patriotic blood-letting that would occur in line of battle.

It has not been many moons since the money-bags of Germany and France were uniting in effort to drag those two nations into war over an opportunity to exploit some markets in northern Africa. But when the Socialists of each country, who represent the great mass of laborers, the stuff that armies are made of, took an open and emphatic stand against such proceedings and began to telegraph from assembly to assembly their congratulations to "our comrades" upon the attitude each assumed, it did not require an extended search to find a peaceful method for settling all "international differences."

The battles of the world have ever been and ever must be fought by the toilers and, in largest measure, by the dis-

inherited of earth. Listen to the voice of a real and consequently a persecuted patriot that has come ringing down through the ages since 150 years before Christ:* "Without houses, without settled habitations, they wander from place to place with their wives and children; and their generals do but mock them when, at the head of their armies, they exhort their men to fight for their sepulchers and the gods of their hearths, for among such numbers perhaps there is not one Roman who has an altar that has belonged to his ancestors or a sepulcher in which their ashes rest. The private soldiers fight and die to advance the wealth and luxury of the great, AND THEY ARE CALLED MASTERS OF THE WORLD WITHOUT HAVING A SOD TO CALL THEIR OWN." There was not room in the Roman Empire for such a man and the ruling rich.

When labor awakens to a realizing sense of the great struggle for which it is so rapidly forming, it will ring down the curtain on the last act of a hideous drama that has reddened the rivers with its blood that a privileged few might inherit the earth—and war will be no more.

XIII.

THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

There is a story in Grecian mythology of a many-headed monster, Hydra, that took up his abode at the only water supply of a certain people. One of the labors of Hercules was to despatch this beast. The difficulty attendant upon this task lay in the power of the monster to replace a severed

* Tiberius Gracchus.

head by one or more other heads. The "labor" was finally accomplished by crushing the thing, heads, body and all beneath a tremendous rock.

The figure is apt for the purpose in hand and the attention of our prohibition, pulverize-the-rum-traffic friends, is especially invited to it.

The monster Hydra of today is an industrial system through which possession has been taken of our people's sources of life-sustenance. It is a many-headed monster and fully capable of producing substitutes for any that, by any sort of device, may be severed as long as the body remains intact. The body is the power and privilege to exploit human labor—to amass dividends.

Now, for the sake of argument, let us grant the possibility of success of a national prohibition party, the abolition of the saloon—grant all that the prohibitionist asks. What has he accomplished? He answers, "I have cut a great head from the Hydra." Yes, you have cut off the saloon head, but what about its substitutes by the way of drug stores, "blind pigs" and "boot-leggers?" "They are not so bad." Let that be granted, too; but they are each a secret, insidious source of evil and there are three of them. We have now granted the best that prohibition could possibly do; therefore, we have a just right to make inquiry as to what it has not done.

If you are sane and intelligent you will grant that the concentration of wealth-ownership in this nation is an evil that must be remedied; in fact you will know that it is in concentrated wealth that the power lies that upholds the evil you are combating—that upholds the saloon system. Put every drop of liquor in the bottom of the ocean—have you stopped wealth concentration? You tell us that if the labor of the nation were all sober, were freed from alcoholic

stimulants, it could produce on the average ten per cent more than when influenced by drink. Let us grant that. For whom would it produce the extra ten per cent? Who would own it when it had been produced? The producers? Not while labor-power is a commodity. The extra per cent would go to the exploiters, some of whose chief functionaries, advocates of the system that concentrates wealth-ownership, are prohibitionists. The only conclusion that can be drawn from your own argument is that, granting all you ask, this evil is augmented.

Again grant all that you ask, are the conditions that would then obtain going to cure the unemployed and the panic evils? There are nearly half a million laborers now employed that your program would at once throw upon the labor market, at least nine-tenths of whom are unfit to make a living in other forms of industry—thanks to the qualification for citizenship that your “sacred system of industry” provides. “Ah,” but you say, “there would be more work in the manufacture of shoes, clothing, etc., for laborers would have more money to spend for such things if they did not drink.” Grant it; and there are half a million more laborers at once demanding jobs. Can your industrial system absorb them? No, the additional demand for produce could be supplied perhaps several times through any sort of well-directed effort of those now idle. It must be kept in mind that there are always now hundreds of thousands, yes, commonly a million or more, and often several millions who are constantly or partially “out of work”—for whom the capitalist system can but partially provide. These alone could easily meet all additional requirements that would result from “more money to spend.” “Then you Socialists contend that those hundreds of thousands in the liquor business should be permitted to carry on this awful traffic in order

that they may make a living?" No, we argue nothing of the sort. We simply call your attention to a condition that must needs follow the enforcement of your demand while the system of industry which you uphold obtains. No, do what you will with the liquor traffic, you will not through such means affect the problem of the unemployed.

And how about panics? They result from producing too much. Labor in a prohibition country would still consume its fifth, or whatever part fell to its share as the seller of its commodity. It certainly would get no more for that commodity than its value. What about the surplus? Would it be increased or diminished? The former is the only possible conclusion. But this is a phase of matters political that does not concern you. You have no interest in the association of this liquor traffic with the system of industry that fosters such things. The system is good enough for you as long as your job, or your privilege to exploit labor, is not menaced.

Then there is a billion dollars' worth of property in the liquor industry. Your policy confiscates that unqualifiedly. Your answer is that property that is being used to degrade mankind ought to be confiscated. Suppose we grant that, too. Now tell us if anywhere this side of hades there is any property that is being used for purposes of deeper or more thorough degradation, for more death dealing purposes than that in which we find the child and woman slave—the mills, mines, factories and sweatshops wherein they by hundreds of thousands are employed? If the products of this enslavement were as generally scattered and as conspicuously displayed as is the effect of drunkenness, it would shame the prohibitionists and would probably awaken many of them to a realizing sense of the needs of the hour. How about confiscating these properties? Why, some of them

doubtless belong to members of the prohibition brand of confiscators.

"But we are opposed to child labor; our platform so states," declares some prohibitionist. And what does your platform say about the system of industry of which child slavery is a regular and consistent part? and that demands that you get your party into power in every state, county and city before you can enact *and enforce after you have enacted* your proposed legislation? The enemies of such enactments are the holders of the purse strings of the people. They are the chief beneficiaries of the present system of industry. They control the political machine and elect "servants of the public" for the express purpose of thwarting the enactment or enforcement of legislation adverse to the interests of themselves and their class. And you are upholding the system of industry that thus fortifies your political enemies, that nullifies your own efforts.

"But the saloon is a powerful means for the corruption of elections. We will stop that," says some thoughtless enthusiast. Are you sincere and simply ignorant in saying that if every drop of liquor were transported to Mars, we would, in the present system of industry, have pure elections, or that they would, to any appreciable degree, be purified? Elections are corrupted for the purpose of obtaining special privileges, franchises, etc. The saloon is used as a means to this end for one reason and one only—it is more convenient and cheaper than some other means. Abolish the saloon and you change not men's ambition to own these things; you simply compel resort to the use of the means that ranks next to the saloon in cheapness and convenience.

"Likewise," says a prohibitionist, "we are opposed to war." And in the next breath he denounces in unmeasured terms some enlightened citizen who is devoting his life

in effort to abolish the thing—and the only thing—that makes war a necessity—capitalism. Put the liquor all in the sea—will that stop war? Not while capitalist prosperity depends upon conquest and retention of foreign markets—not while capitalism is the order of industry.

Yes, there are many heads to this Hydra, capitalism, and he winks at the puny efforts of the prohibitionist. "But," says some advocate, "we want, we must have prohibition now. We can't wait for the establishment of a co-operative commonwealth, we can't wait for the enforcement of the common remedy for all these evils. We must cure them one at a time." If we are to wait for the national success of the prohibition party in order to partially rid ourselves of one evil and a correspondingly long time to remedy each of the others, how many millenniums are to be consumed in such a process of procrastination? Has the prohibition party ever secured prohibition in any state, county, or even city of any note? Prohibition has been carried in such states as Maine and Kansas practically independently of any political organization, by the people who are opposed to the traffic on moral grounds, because of the self-evident evil of the thing; and in the South as an economic necessity. In these contests the prohibition party, as such, was not a considerable factor. The southerner must keep liquor from the workers in order to better qualify them for exploitation; but we may rest assured the southern brand of prohibition will not seriously inconvenience the members of their "chivalry."

Socialists are by no means oblivious to the devastation wrought by the rum habit; but we classify it where it belongs, as but one of many evils consequent in large measure, if not entirely, upon an industrial system—the system of profit. The saloon business in its every phase, like any other business in capitalism, is run for gain, run because

there is a possible eight-cents profit in a ten-cent drink. Socialism would abolish the saloon by abolishing the profit upon which it thrives. Then we would leave the question of a local dispensary and all else that pertained to it, as all such questions must ultimately be left, to the people of a locality to decide for themselves.

With the saloon gone, there is left to deal with nothing that pertains to the traffic except the thirst for liquor for its own sake—the desire to drink for the sensation produced by the poison. Here again it is evident that a co-operative commonwealth would, in this instance as in others, fall heir to a lot of the wrecks of capitalism and be compelled to deal with them as best it could.

But Socialism would accomplish various things that would soon do away with the evil entirely. First. As before stated, it would at once eliminate the institution known as the saloon by eliminating the profits for which it is run. Second. It would abolish the social feature of the “drink” and in that alone prevent, in very large measure, the making of drunkards of young men and women. Third. With a very small fraction of what now goes to support parasites and idlers (an insignificant fraction of the \$8 worth) it would establish recreative centers such as gymnasiums, reading rooms, lecture halls, theatricals, etc., that would be far more attractive than buying a jug of liquor and seeking some secluded quarters for a debauch. Fourth. It would abolish poverty and slavish toil—the chief causes of indulgence in strong drink. Fifth. Socialism would not seek to change human nature. It is not human nature to be a drunkard, any more than it is human nature to keep a few hundreds of thousands of women and children at work in sweat-shops or mills and mines. Socialism would revolu-

tionize the environment that breeds drunkards and sweat-shop workers just as cesspools breed maggots. If human nature would then assert itself along right lines. It is not human nature to do wrong—to maintain injurious, abnormal relations between individuals or between men and things; but it is human nature to seek compensation for effort, no matter where that compensation is found, even though that reward may be so slight and strange a thing as a temporary surcease from the effects of toil or trouble or the sting of poverty by distortion of the brain with stimulants. A system of industry that lays rewards in the direction of wrong doing, that “puts a premium on every act that smells of hell,” must needs lead human nature, must guide human beings into evil courses. The basis of morality, that from which we garner our concepts of right and wrong relations between things, lies in our environment; and the most potent elements of that environment are vested in our industrial system.

Sweden, even in capitalism, through the medium of a system in some features similar to the one that would naturally form a part of a socialist commonwealth, has in recent years reduced her distilleries from 23,000 to 132 and her national per capita consumption of liquor to less than one-third the quantity that obtained when her system was first inaugurated.*

Attention should also be called to this fact, that while the men now engaged in the liquor traffic can plead justification for their opposition to prohibition on the ground that it is unjust to confiscate a business that, under license of law, was permitted to grow and absorb capital, and likewise un-

* Henry Smith Williams, in *McClure's* for February, 1909.

just to deprive without recompense anyone of a means of livelihood long sanctioned by legal enactment, no such plea can hold against the methods of Socialism. Socialism would destroy alike the saloon business and the grocery business as they are now operated—as profit yielding concerns; but it would provide alike for the grocer and the saloon keeper (and for every one else) a means of livelihood better than that of which either would be deprived. Unlimited access to the means of production and the full social equivalent of one's labor—the least that Socialism can offer—would make the average gain from a saloon or a grocery shop look small indeed. Socialism may take away a means of life, but it offers a far better one in exchange; prohibition takes everything in sight and offers in return—the capitalistic labor market or the road.

The trouble with the prohibitionist is that he knows nothing whatever of economics and consequently he no more thinks of associating the great evil of the rum traffic with our system of industry than with the differential calculus. The fact that it is but one head of a polycephalus hydra has never dawned upon him. When the saloon is out of the way, when men have better opportunity to work than to drink, when the certainty of a good home and the chance to enjoy the fruits abundant of his or her own industry is laid before each young man and woman, when avenues of recreation that are healthful, varied and inspiring are substituted for capitalism's dives and dens, when man's environment shall have been clarified of the dispiriting, enervating thralldom of today, when Socialism is the order of industry, the liquor question becomes one of easy solution. But as long as profit from its sale flows into the coffers of the dispenser, as long as poverty, wretchedness and toil is the allotment of the

millions, as long as conditions of life are such as to invite the assuaging or drowning of weariness or memory or sorrow or despair or hopelessness in the flowing bowl, the drink habit is but one form of adaptation of life to the conditions in which it is engulfed.

PART II.

SOME VITAL TOPICS

I.

PROPERTY—COLLECTIVE AND PRIVATE.

In Part I of this volume the principal problems that press for solution at the hands of the people of this country (and other countries as well) have received special attention. It has been shown that they are but effects of a common cause. They are consequent on a system of industry and they can be solved only through an entire change—a revolution—in that system. By far the greater fraction of what labor produces is passed, through the operation of the present system, into the possession of the exploiters of toil. This was found to be an essential consequence of a single condition—the private ownership of the nation's sources of subsistence. To this condition was traced every problem; of it each was born as legitimately as a child of wedlock.

Since these problems have a common origin, it follows that they have a common method of solution. Their origin lies in the privileges that constitute private ownership; their solution lies in the abolition of those privileges. It is certainly a waste of energy to attempt to remedy the evils consequent on the exploitation of labor by any means that leaves the exploiter in possession of the nation's resources when that possession is impos-

sible—is worthless—without the privilege of exploitation. It is exploitation of labor, the creation of surplus-products, surplus-values, that must cease; and that cessation is impossible as long as the means of production are privately owned. Through collective ownership alone can these evil-breeding privileges be abolished; therefore, that is what we demand. Until the fact of necessity for the abolition of private ownership in these things has found lodgment in a brain, there is little hope of finding an entrance or room for any other. If that necessity has not already been made clear, hope for the success of more extended effort is abandoned. If that conviction is secure, all else is easy of comprehension. And let us not at this stage of discussion worry about how collective acquisition of the industries shall be accomplished. It is sufficient now to decide, to admit, that they must be acquired.

Let it be understood, once and for all, that Socialists make no demand for collective ownership of any thing except the things from which the nation obtains its livelihood—the things used collectively in supplying the needs of humanity—the land and other natural resources, the factories, mills, mines, coal beds, oil fields, forests, the means of transportation and communication—the things upon which life in the aggregate is dependent. These are now privately owned and can be operated or used only for profit; in collective ownership, profit would necessarily be eliminated.

“Why would profit necessarily be eliminated”? asks some questioner. “We now publicly own parts of industries and run them at a profit. Some English cities make such a profit from their municipally owned institutions that no tax levy is necessary. Public ownership does not

bar profit." True, and that is wherein it is in no sense Socialism. That is why Socialists have so little interest in it. In the capitalist system of industry, the temptation to use these publicly owned utilities as profit makers is too great for resistance. That profit which comes so largely from the pockets of the numerous workers who must patronize these publicly owned institutions goes to pay by indirect means what the property-owners would otherwise have to contribute as a direct tax. The possibility of achieving just that result—an avenue of escape from the tax collectors—is the line of argument that wins the support of the propertied class of the cities in effort to secure municipal ownership of gas, water, lighting plants, etc. Japan publicly owns more industries than any other nation and she is using them to exploit her people to the starvation point. She must have the profits to pay her war debts and to build enough Dreadnaughts to withstand the caresses of her Christian friends.

Socialism demands collective ownership *as a means and the only means to an end*. The end is to establish an industrial system in which labor-exploitation is impossible—and therefore where profit is impossible. The old party advocates of public ownership "in spots" have no such ambition. Most of them thrive upon exploited labor, and wherein any species of public ownership deprives them personally of their exploiting privilege, they spurn it as a thing of terror.

To understand the Socialists' position fully it is necessary here to recall several things that have previously been stated either directly or by implication.

In order to carry on a civilized state of society, as for instance in the United States, the labor of a vast body of human beings is necessary. These must perform all sorts

of labor both mental and manual. They must cultivate and garner all manner of the produce of the farm. They must dig raw material from the earth and shape it into useful things—do all things necessary to manufacturing. They must transport everything wherever needed, and do all that should be required in the work of exchange. They must educate the young and care for the afflicted. They must put in sewer systems and build railroads, homes and public buildings. They must do everything necessary to the maintenance of the race in the highest civilized state. All this is socially necessary labor, and those who do it are the socially necessary laborers. The total product of this labor is the total social product; and no one kind, class, grade or craft of these laborers is in any sense more entitled to be classed as productive laborers than is any other. All necessary laborers are equally productive laborers. The labor of a teacher in educating the young for future usefulness is just as essential to production in our civilized state as is the work of a miner, engineer, carpenter, manager, hod-carrier, scientist or inventor.

Arguing from our original assumption, these necessary laborers receive as their share about one-fifth of the total social product. Whether that fraction is finally proven to be too great or too small does not materially concern us. We know that whatever it may be, it simply pays the cost of reproducing the necessary laborers. We also know that the remaining fraction, and much the greater fraction, goes for the support of non-essential persons, things and institutions. It supports, for instance, many times the necessary number of wholesale establishments, retail concerns, banks and newspapers. thousands upon thousands of superfluous offices and business

headquarters, tens of thousands of needless so-called "professional men," builds every needless mansion and yacht, supports the profligate rich and buys every foreign dude,—pays multiplied billions in dividends, interest and rent, makes possible and necessary the concentration of wealth-ownership and embodies in one whole every industrial problem with which the world today is struggling. This we know and it is sufficient.

Socialism has for its final purpose the organization of industry and society generally on such a basis as will eliminate the non-essential. It would (and will) so organize society that each member thereof must, in order to exist, perform some sort of useful, needful function. It does not propose to compel any person to do any certain thing or particular sort of work. No such drastic measures will be at all necessary; no marshalling of laborers as in military regiments under compulsion to perform certain duties, a la mode the "socialism" of Hon. W. J. Bryan will ever be in any manner an essential mode of procedure. But it does propose that each shall enjoy the social product of labor in proportion to his contribution to that labor.

When we say that in Socialism all must work or starve, we do not include those mentally or physically incapacitated. In a Socialist state, one would have to give in exchange for a commodity as much labor as would equal the social-labor embodied in it. For instance, if working with the best possible appliances (and any laborer not so working is doing needless labor, represents a waste to society) a laborer in 10 hours can produce 5 pairs of shoes, he could not have as his reward for that labor 5 pairs of shoes. For while he was making those shoes, educational work had to be done, hospitals

had to be operated, the mentally and physically incapacitated had to be cared for—all socially necessary labor that cannot be actually employed in forming raw material into useful things was being carried on; and the cost of maintenance of these things is a part of the cost of the social product. Our shoemaker might get 3 or 4 pairs of shoes for his labor and still get the full social equivalent of his product. *Whatever was his reward it would be his private property.*

Then private property is by no means destroyed by Socialism. The fact is, so far as the great mass of humanity is concerned, Socialism would tremendously augment private property. The cry of the capitalists about Socialism's destroying private property has its basis in the fact that the property created would belong to the creator and not to the exploiters—it would destroy their private property in labor-power. But certainly labor would find nothing to regret in that condition of things. There is here involved no question of the creation of private property; the matter that worries the capitalists is the manner of its proposed distribution. The would-be millionaire could not get it; therefore, he argues, it would not exist. Socialism demands the collective ownership of the things that are now used as a means through which to exploit labor; or, to be more exact, the things used collectively—the sources of our subsistence and all sorts of public institutions. The equivalent of the shoes produced by the shoemaker would be his, and so would be anything else that he saw fit to buy with it, to exchange it for. He could not invest it in an institution in which it were necessary to employ laborers to work for him, because the general reward for labor would be its full social product and he could not pay that and make a

profit. Without profit from their labor he could not employ laborers in what we now know as a business or industry—or at least he would not if he belonged outside an asylum. But he could, with profit to himself and mankind in general, invest it in a home, in travel, in learning, in an automobile, in any sort of property or thing that he desired that is not collectively used.

In other words, in a Socialist state, labor-power ceases to be a commodity. In capitalism, one purchases labor-power and in consuming it (utilizing it), he makes it produce several times the amount of value that he exchanged for it. He pays, say, \$1.50 for the labor-power commodity and when he has consumed it, he has values that he exchanges for \$5. He can impose this condition upon the seller of labor-power because he owns the means for the consumption or utilization of that power. That ownership has passed entirely beyond the possession of the tool-user. When these things are collective property, no such imposition is possible. It would not be possible even if it were desired to operate this collective property at a profit. To whom would the profit go? To the owners—the entire population. A people as a whole can not exploit themselves. Exploitation can be accomplished only as a privilege conferred upon a part of a people—the privilege to exploit the rest. But the “pure and simple” public ownership advocate wants a part of the exploiting mediums owned by the public and so run as to pay the public debts and thus augment the gains from what is still privately owned. He is willing that the public should acquire ownership in what is not to him a source of profit—almost any sort of industry except his own. We say to him: “It is your property—that is, your privilege to exploit labor—that we are after. We

do not want any other of your belongings. If you have a home, you are fortunate and no one desires to disturb you in its possession. If you have a mansion, we do not want it; and when you have to work for your living instead of living from the toil of others, you probably will not want it either. In addition, you are welcome to as much of any sort of property that is not used for exploiting purposes as you can accumulate from your own labor. Its ownership can work injury to none. But you cannot own what others create unless they voluntarily give it to you. You cannot compel others to produce for your individual purse or bank account—you cannot own a collective necessity, an exploiting medium. These alone would constitute collectively owned property; all else would be privately owned, or at least could be privately owned and would be as long as the people so determined, and no injury would be consequent upon that ownership."

Private property, then, in Socialism, would consist, first, of all such material things as a person desired to possess by rendering to society the equivalent of the social-labor necessary to produce them. This would place all necessary private property easily within the reach of all. No such opportunity is possible in capitalism. Labor-power is now a commodity; its reward is the cost of its reproduction. That condition is incompatible with, in fact, bars general accumulation. Second, every person in a Socialist state owns and every child born in it inherits the right of access to the sources of being—owns or inherits a certain and valuable mode of subsistence—owns or inherits an absolute safeguard against poverty with all its fearful inroads upon life, liberty and happiness. There is no such boon—such private prop-

erty—within the bounds of capitalism. Third, every child born in Socialism inherits still another endowment such as capitalism cannot supply—the certainty of a training for life to the extent of its capacity—the richest endowment that man can confer. It inherits every proper right and privilege of life among a free, educated, self-dependent people—life among a nation of men and women, not of a relatively few millionaires and a mass of exploited dependants. Verily, there is private property that does not consist of material things and that even our reputed wealthy cannot possess.

II.

LABOR

In this discussion reference is made only to useful labor, such as the carrying on of civilization demands—such as will be carried on when society is so organized that the wastes of capitalism are eliminated.

The various units of our society have desires and needs that they wish to gratify, and these units possess the mental and physical qualities necessary for the gratification of every need. That is, labor-power, the ability to produce, is abundant for every requirement. Socialists charge the capitalist system of industry, first, with inability to develop this power to the highest state of efficiency; second, with inability to properly use and direct it even in its present undeveloped state; third, with inability (impossibility) to use it at all except as it can be made to produce surpluses, profits, for the owners of the means for its utilization.

Again, proper, up-building, healthful desires multiply with the possibilities of their gratification; and the degree of development of such desires and the means for gratifying them distinguishes the civilized man and his enriched environment from the savage and his barren surroundings. 'Civilization is doing its best work wherein the balance between desires and the means for their gratification is so maintained as to develop the best effort for attainment on the part of all the millions of our people. Where the means for the gratification of desires are unlimited, desires become excessive and abnormal and their gratification destructive of potential development along proper lines. At the other extreme, where the means for gratifying desires are dwarfed and stunted, so are the mental and physical wrecks that these conditions produce. Therefore, degeneracy in the palace and in the slum.

The Socialist holds that despite all that is squandered by the rich, despite all surpluses sold in foreign markets, and despite all unsalable accumulations that breed panics and starvation, this nation has never produced sufficient commodities to supply the desires that make for the most fruitful advancement. And as for the distribution of those commodities, as for the gratification of desires such as those for which commodities should be created, it is enough to say that progress has taken place in spite of it. The nation has never worked to anything even verging upon its potential capacity. Millions of its people do not know how to work at anything that civilization should demand to be done; millions more are wasting energy eking out an existence by obsolete, wasteful methods, and still other millions are idle all or part of the time. There is no ground for doubt that through thorough organization of all ablebodied beings equipped with the best pos-

sible appliances, and a work day of the hours that now constitute the average day for laborers, the people of the United States could produce at least four or five times the present annual product. And it is timely here to suggest that such a product owned by those who produced it might result in a picnic but not in a panic. In the present system of industry, it would be a calamity that could logically have but one of two effects—general starvation, or the overturning of the nation in bread riots.

But such a product would never be a necessity; therefore, neither would be the labor required to yield it. Nor would double, or more than double, the present product be necessary to meet every need in real progress—the building of the best manhood and womanhood—the equipment of the masses for what Spencer calls “complete living.” It is evident, then, that in a state organized as Socialism demands—stripped of all capitalistic waste elements—an average work day of three or four hours and a distribution of the resulting product according to the deserts of each producer would yield results wholly unattainable in the present condition of society.

Men and women labor in the industries to earn a living. If a livelihood could be acquired through less toil of course advantage would be taken of such opportunity. They now labor, say, ten hours. They can then go to the market and purchase what two of those hours produced. and yet that product supplies them a living. Out of that scant product the millions of laborers must accumulate their private property if they ever have any. But it must here be recalled that it is not the mission of capitalism to supply laborers with means or opportunity for the acquisition of property. That is not necessary to the reproduction of labor-power. If these same millions

could consume the product of eight hours instead of two, or such other hours as they saw fit to work, if there were no parasitic exploiters that they must support, would not the resulting effect upon their private holdings be very favorable to them? Would a laborer continue to work such long hours? Yes, if he needed for his own use the equivalent of such a product. Otherwise he evidently would shorten his labor day or work less days, and he would not have to strike in probably a fruitless effort to gain the reduction.

The system would be self-adjusting. There could not occur a general overproduction, and a few years of experience in organized direction of labor would prevent an over-supply in any line. If a man worked time or overtime, it would be because he personally desired to consume in some manner the equivalent product; hence, consumption would always average to equal production. If three hours' work per day would average to produce all that the nation desired to consume, there would exist no necessity for an average day's work of more than three hours. Then if one desired to work "two days in one"—to work six hours per day for a time—and thus accumulate a demand against the social product, there need be nothing to prevent his doing so. His desire is for extra things that he will in his own time and manner consume. He may want finer furnishings for his home; he may desire to take a day off and see something of other countries. Whatever he determines, the extra product will in some form and manner always be consumed. Of course laborers could not all "lay off" at the same time, nor would they so desire. If it were necessary to regulate such matters authoritatively, that need work no hardships.

Access to the industries must be made free to all. Each may average to work as much or as little as he pleases, but what he is privileged to consume must be the equivalent of what he produces. Each then is "the builder of his own fortune." His private property would depend solely upon his own effort, his own work, and not upon his working others. "But," says one, "if three hours' labor per day would supply all one needed, people would get lazy and indifferent." The fact is, the breeder of carelessness, indifference, lack of interest and ennui among laborers is long hours, not short. A large majority of all fatalities and accidents occur during the last hours of the present long days of toil. Persons seriously suggesting such a thought are generally those so inured to capitalism that their conception of life is one spent in the industries, toiling to create millionaires and accepting a crust for their own portion. To prevent one's getting lazy, he must be forced to live in a shed while he builds mansions for the exploiters of his labor. The thought is not only illogical; it is barbarous and repulsive to intelligence. There is no other incentive to effort so potent as the certainty of reward; in fact, hope of or certainty of reward in some form is practically the only incentive. That certainty Socialism would offer, and the offer would yield its fruits.

If there were nothing in life to engage one's attention, to occupy one's time—to work at—except the industries, except the getting of a living, there might be something of substance in the "production of laziness" idea. In Socialism, work in the industries would be very much of the nature of an incident in one's career. Now it is the whole determining factor. There would be time for home beautification and homes to beautify. There would be

time and opportunity for mental and physical improvement and an early training that would qualify one to use them. Of course, for a time, the wrecked relicts of capitalism would have to be dealt with, but that would at the worst be but a temporary matter.

But grant for a moment that enervation of the race would result from the inauguration of Socialism and let us question what the admission implies. To so contend one must hold that a rising generation of Americans cannot be trained mentally and manually to make proper use of time not spent in the creation of a plutocracy, in supporting the industrially needless; or what is the same thing, that if labor were granted a remuneration three or four times what it now receives, though it were educated and trained to its fullest capacity, it would degenerate. Instances have occurred, notably in remote mining regions, wherein wages, for quite a series of years, were far above the average, but there is no record of any resultant enervation among the recipients. The hypothesis also implies that laborers are retained at a higher standard of manhood when kept in comparative ignorance and robbed of the larger fraction of their labor product than would obtain if they were far better mentally equipped and granted the greater returns. Is this possible? If so, then, in Socialism, it might be found necessary to continue the extra hours of toil and then throw the resulting surplus into the sea. Absurd as this seems (and is), that disposition of the product would be far better for all mankind than to do with it as we now do—turn it over to those who do not create it.

If Socialism is not able to ward off enervation, wherein will lie the cause of that inability? It will be because and only because there is not sufficient requirement for

labor in the industries. And why not enough labor? For the reason that so much work is done through the medium of machinery instead of being done by hand methods. It has already been made sufficiently clear that the increased product due to the use of machinery cannot, as now, continue to accumulate in the hands of a relatively few owners of the machines. Then if that product cannot pass into the possession of the masses without dwarfing them mentally and physically, it is clear that the Chinese solution of the machine problem—its destruction and a return to hand methods of production—is the only alternative. Capitalism and the machine cannot much longer abide; if Socialism and the machine are incompatible, then the machine must go. Is civilization ready to grant that conclusion? Not at least until experimentation has demonstrated necessity for such measures. Thus the proposition of enervation dissolves into the ridiculous. As has already been suggested, capitalist methods of education, of life, of toil, of entertainment, of spending hours outside of factories, mills and mines; capitalist environment with its money-making dives and dens, its corrupting, seductive institutions based solely on profit, its meager preparation or total lack of preparation, of the young for citizenship and manhood generally, has for so long been instilled into human experience and thought that it is but natural that mankind should find difficulty in effort to divorce its thought from all this hideousness and conceive of conditions that will naturally follow the elimination of human parasitism. The poor, deluded mortals imagine that human nature must change before a system of justice can be established; as though human nature could change without first changing the environment that molds and develops

those qualities and characteristics that constitute human nature.

"But some would be lazy and refuse to work," says some soft-handed capitalist. Why should that concern us? Each will be rewarded, will be privileged to consume, according to his contribution to production. If one sees fit to starve voluntarily, the sooner humanity is rid of him the better. That is no concern of yours except in so far as such things appeal to your purely humanitarian instincts. If self-dependence such as Socialism must impose, aided by scientific treatment, if need be, does not cure such relicts of capitalism, does not avert such atavistic tendencies, they are incurable and the disease must do its work.

"If one were allowed to work more than another, we would have inequality of possessions as now—we would still have rich and poor," says some property-monger. All poverty would be voluntarily inflicted upon one's self and such poverty is not a subject for charitable consideration. And as for riches, they would have to be acquired by one's own labor and are not liable to be of enviable proportions. Riches are not accumulated in that way. To get possession of even one million—a very insignificant fortune these days—one must clear above all expenses one hundred dollars for every working day for over thirty years. How evident it is that others must be worked in that process, that he who amasses it gets something (practically everything) for nothing. All accumulations would be in non-exploiting form, and why should such ownership annoy other people? Capitalism seems to some people to be so good, so desirable, that if Socialism appears to retain to any degree even one minor fea-

ture of it, that retention is sufficient to condemn the whole proposed system of the Socialists.

If three or four hours were established as the standard or average duration of a day's labor, were found sufficient for all purposes of production, it does not by any means follow that that many hours need constitute a day at all sorts of labor. Some kinds of work are much to be preferred to others, yet each should be free to choose for himself or herself a place in the industries. Some hold that if an average of three or four hours per day (and that would be abundant) would supply all needs, the sort of work should not be a consideration. All should be ready to volunteer for any calling. But it must be kept in mind that it will be necessary to deal with persons as they are and not as they should be. The sort of work would be considered and seriously too, and the matter of ready volunteers is very problematical. All difficulty thus arising could easily be met by grading the hours that shall constitute a day's work according to the general desirability or repulsiveness of the task. No work is so undesirable that a shortened day (greater reward), say to two hours, would not attract all needed workers; while, in some cases, it might be necessary to establish some grades of work on a five or six-hour basis in order to prevent an oversupply in that calling. A brief experience would soon determine all this in such a manner as to leave each free to choose as his tastes might dictate. No necessity for compulsion need exist. Again, if one were properly educated, not simply molded into a part of a machine, a change of occupation would not be a matter of great moment or inconvenience. Adaptability would be readily acquired. Whether this method of dealing with the question will be adopted or not is a matter for

determination, like many others, when that determination is necessary; but we know that it could be met in this way and that it presents a problem of no great moment for an industrial congress. A disposition of this matter of grading labor after the plan here suggested would result in the most undesirable kinds of work being done by the most intellectual members of society—by those who know best how to utilize time for their own physical and mental betterment. Of course the natural extension of the use of mechanical devices would very rapidly reduce unpleasant or laborious tasks to a minimum. They would well nigh if not entirely in time disappear.

It must not be overlooked that the matter of dealing with different kinds of labor would be much simplified by the fact that the part one assumed in the work of production—the necessary labor—in a co-operative commonwealth would have no bearing whatever upon his social standing. Now it is practically the determining factor—a very natural consequence wherein some have to produce a living for others—wherein the conditions of slave and master obtain.

III.

THE FARMER

Those who have not followed these discussions with analytical eye might assume that the farmer has not been given due consideration. While he, for obvious reasons, has not been especially designated, he has been constantly in mind, and much of the argument advanced applies as directly to him as to the other members of exploited humanity.

There are farmers and farmers. There are land owners who reside upon their holdings but who no more think of turning a furrow or tying a sheaf than does some large factory owner or stock holder of entering that factory and actually doing needful labor. These are owners of our sources of subsistence which they use solely as exploiting mediums. They are not the farmers here to be considered, nor do they any more represent or typify the great mass of humanity who do the productive work of agriculture and grazing than a Morgan typifies the steel workers.

For the wage worker, it is clear, there is nothing in industry but subsistence; for the tenant farmer, it goes without saying, there is, there can be nothing more. And there is certainly little evidence that the small land owner who works for a living has fared much better in the accumulation of material wealth. He is directly or indirectly the prey of about every form of trust and combine; he is among the most liberal contributors to profit and interest funds. He has no voice in determining the price of what he buys or what he sells. He receives his purchases from the hand of one monopoly; he passes his produce into the keeping of another. And by the time the railroads, the milling trust, the meat trust, the implement trust and the grain speculators and gamblers get through with him, he finds that he has left just about the equivalent of an average laborer's job—enough to reproduce his kind; and it keeps him hustling to do that. His boys grow to young manhood and desert the homestead as do rats a leaking ship. There is little attraction there for them. The hours are long, the work is disagreeable, dirty and laborious. A few of them are found in factories, many of them on railroads and street car lines. There their

remuneration is at least equal to the net returns from the farm, the work is more pleasant and they see far more of life—live closer to civilization. They prefer the lash of the industrial boss to the proverbial “independence of the farmer.”

The independence that characterized the agriculturist of former days has practically passed away. Capitalism is not curbed by line fences. The tenant farmer—and he works about half the land of the nation—is well nigh if not fully as much of a subordinate as the grown factory slave; and the “land owner” under mortgage carries the regulation ball and chain. Then, over all, the usurping trust asserts its uncompromising, tyrannous sway. Occasionally the agriculturist buckles on his armor for independent economic and political action, as in the Grange and the populist movements, only to learn that while the great exploiters are on the field, though he may here and there gain a temporary, unimportant advantage, he is battling with a thoroughly equipped, trained, conscienceless, sleepless combine—the political machines of capitalism. His “conquest” is brief and practically fruitless. He learns that he might just as well harken to the admonition of his national representative, Secretary Wilson, and “keep out of the clouds; keep in the furrows.” And the Secretary might with propriety have added: “That is where you belong. It is your function to grow grain; leave everything else to the gamblers and those whose trade is politics.” The fact is, the farmer is no part of the great business world. He is wholly without that sphere and, like all others so destined, is a prey to those within the charmed circles.

The Socialists, in most countries where they have gained the greatest number of adherents, have not made

as relatively rapid progress in proselyting among the agriculturists as among those engaged in other forms of industry. This is probably for two reasons: In propaganda work, the farmer is not as accessible as the wage worker or even the small business man in the centers of population. In the second place, the small land owner feels that he has a grasp upon a means of life—a life tenure on a job even though it be a poor one. The task may be hard, but (if unencumbered by mortgage) it is not in the shadow of a master's discharge; it is at least his. He is disposed to suffer the ills that be, rather than fly to those that he knows not of. Through capitalistic sources there has been implanted in his mind that the "confiscating Socialists are after his small competency" and, as he is practically unfit for any other calling, and utterly ignorant of what Socialism has in store for him, he fights shy of the new, revolutionary faith.

But thus far in the American movement, the farmer has been found as easily approachable as laborers in any other calling. In the Grange and the populist campaigns, he learned some valuable lessons, and rapidly he is coming to realize that he has a common cause with the rest of the exploited masses. The necessity for government ownership of the trusts is brought home to him through practical channels; and from that conviction to a sense of what must logically follow the adoption of such measures—to the entire plan of Socialist organization of industry—is but a brief step. A few years' experience with trusts, money lenders, and organized meat and grain gamblers has removed from his mind all terror of any form of "confiscation" even remotely suggested by the Socialists. He has too long been subjected to the real thing as practiced through capitalism.

At its worst, what has a farmer to lose by the establishment of a co-operative commonwealth? For illustration, suppose that today the government, or, for that matter, any absolutely responsible corporation, should send agents to the farmers of the country with this proposition: "We want a deed to your land, and in payment we offer to you and your sons and your sons' sons in perpetuity one dollar per hour for every hour that you desire to work and you may work on the average as many or as few hours as you see fit." Now the farmers of this nation who would not accept that contract in exchange for their land holdings, say "aye." What are these land holdings? A means of livelihood. What is offered in exchange for them? Not a cent in cash until it is earned, yet a means of livelihood that far exceeds in value the land possessions. How many of these farmers would go to court with the plea that even the forcing of such conditions upon them was in any sense confiscation? Yet the fact remains that a co-operative commonwealth that would not make better provision for every farmer than that suggested in this hypothetical offer would be a failure. We know that with industry thoroughly organized, with the needless, wasteful and parasitic elements all eliminated, the people of this country could easily make every hour of productive labor yield the doer thereof far more than can be purchased at this time for one dollar. Let a farmer once realize what this means for him and his descendants and he is ready to make short work of the system of capitalism.

There is no doubt that in the organization of a co-operative commonwealth, whether that organization cover a period of long or short duration, the land offers by far the most complex and difficult problem. Practi-

cally all other industries are already so fully organized that if the present hours and wage scales were retained, the change would scarcely be perceptible. But the capitalistic land scheme is disorganization gone mad. Not that the people will want to cling to their holdings. The younger generations now desert them for fifty dollars per month, or little more, as street car conductors. More difficulty will be encountered in keeping people on the land than in getting them off of it. But to organize the agricultural industries so as to use to the fullest capacity modern machinery and scientific methods—to eliminate the incalculable wastes everywhere now so evident in this tremendous thing—will be a task of far greater proportions, will require more skill, more tests and experimentation, more time and thought than all other industries combined. But it is a task that must be carried out to its uttermost limit and no other field of human activity will yield such rich returns for the labor required to perfect it. And when it is finished there will not be found a dozen or more different sorts of stuff growing upon every insignificant patch of ground commonly not properly adapted to any of them and hedged in by expensive and unnecessary fences; nor will meat be provided from stock reared in regions of long winters where they must be fed from labor's product for months of every year. Capitalism, that is, industrial anarchy, alone makes such wastes necessary or tolerable in the twentieth century.

IV.

GOVERNMENT

Government may be defined in general terms as such organized means or powers as the people of a political

division use in enacting, interpreting, and enforcing their laws and in perpetuating their institutions.

Government implies organization for definite purposes and the institution of definite means for carrying out those purposes. Its object is to establish and maintain certain relations between human beings that are designated as "rights" and its forms have been as various as have been man's conceptions of what should constitute those "rights."

In some countries, "rights," as locally and, historically speaking, temporarily defined, are maintained by vesting in one person of certain parentage and reputed heaven-ordained mission supreme power over all others, their "rights" to life, liberty and worldly possessions being subject to his will. In some other countries the people have the "privilege" of leaving the determination of their "rights" in the keeping of a few of their members of fortunate parentage. In still others, what the people may do and what they may not do is determined by a goodly number, partly of the people's choosing, who may establish such relations between men as they see fit, provided, that one person of certain ancestral descent does not object. Yet again, as in our own country, questions of rights and privileges are determined by a few hundred men, selected, directly or indirectly, by the people themselves, who have power to make such determination as five out of nine other persons appointed to irresponsible life-tenures may sanction.

It is noteworthy that in all these forms of government, final authority in determining the relations of man to man, in determining what a people may do and what they may not do, is vested in from one to a few persons who are in nowise directly responsible to a constituency

—is absolutely removed from the people themselves. It is openly admitted by the chief beneficiaries of these organizations that the people as a whole cannot be trusted with power to determine what should constitute proper relations among themselves; and it is the function of the beneficiaries, always in command of the organized powers, to see to it that no such authority is bestowed upon the masses.

The reason for this state of affairs is found solely in this, that governmental organizations incorporate certain privileges, confer upon a part of the people the right to prey upon the rest. These privileges must be safeguarded, and it is but natural that their keeping cannot be intrusted to those who constitute the source of prey. The reins of authority must be in the hands of the beneficiaries of any established order—in the keeping of the owning, exploiting class. In the founding of our governmental organization, privileges were established, and the course of that government must be such as to retain them as though an inviolable, unchangeable covenant. To do this, centralization of authority is an absolute requirement.

The various forms of government that men have established have ever been well adapted to the purpose for which each was intended, and it is but reasonable to presume that they will always be so. For instance, there is no more government in the United States than is needed for the purpose that it serves, and, if capitalism is to remain the order of industry, our organization is admirably adapted to it. For if at any time it is found wanting in adaptation, adjustment is readily attainable by the privileged class. It now, without any change in the fundamental law, includes some very marked features

that were foreign to the intentions of its founders; but circumstances have developed necessity for them and they are, or apparently soon will be, permanently established. Notable among these are the absolute supremacy of our courts, the power conferred upon our military authorities by what is known as the Dick Bill, the conversion of our state guards into regular army reserves, the ever increasing power of officials as censors of the press, the constant tendency to abridgment of free speech and even free assembly, and a marked curtailment of the right of franchise. Viewed philosophically, there is nothing in these encroachments upon the earlier liberties of our people that is illogical or abnormal. The privileges of the exploiter must be maintained and, to safeguard them, these are all measures of ever increasing necessity.

The Socialist is in no sense opposed to government. He knows that as long as society is organized, there will exist necessity for rules of action. That implies law making and enforcing. To the question of how much or what kind of government, he makes the only answer that sanity could dictate—that is a matter that circumstances must determine. As before stated, the world has never had any more government than was needed to accomplish the purposes for which it is used. If the time ever comes (and it certainly will) when few or no policemen and no soldiers are needed, they surely will not be maintained; but while they are a necessary adjunct, they will certainly be factors in organization. A co-operative commonwealth, having no private interests to serve, would logically vest all final authority in the people themselves through the initiative and referendum in legislation. It would have no use whatever for a senate empowered to undo the work of its directly elected representatives. It

may need courts but not to set aside its legislative enactments nor to liberate its most conspicuous criminals. Capitalism needs these things and therefore we have them. Socialism would substitute an industrial for a political congress because that is what conditions would call for in the Socialist regime. The acts of such a congress would be subject to referendum and its members to recall. That does not mean that all its acts would be referred to the people, but it does mean that the people would have the right to order the reference of any act and the sole power to confirm or annul it.

No, Socialists have no thought of abolishing government. What they will abolish is the industrial system that calls for the present form of organization. When co-operative industry is the established order, whatever legislative bodies and whatever officials are needed to properly carry it on will certainly be a part of the system. Then, as now, the system of industry will determine the nature and extent of government.

Nor can a government adapted to a thoroughly co-operative system contain any element of tyranny. It is not tyrannous, nor is it anything that savors of slavery to demand that every able-bodied person shall render to society the social equivalent of the labor products consumed by him. Tyranny and slavery exist wherever one person, in order to produce his own living, is compelled also to provide that of another. A people as a whole cannot enslave themselves. Master and subordinate, exploiter and exploited are essential factors to slavery. Socialism cannot make persons individually equal in any sense; but it can endow each with equal opportunity in life. *Equal opportunity bars absolutely any species of slavery.* The extent to which one utilizes his opportu-

ity will depend wholly upon himself. It is his and none can deprive him of it; but he is responsible for results. Of course capitalist apologists claim that all now have equal opportunity; and if they would but add that the opportunity to which they refer is to be somebody's hired man, their claim would verge closely upon the truth. One man's son is now born the possessor a billion dollars worth of opportunities and your son with the privilege to serve him, provided his agents see fit to hire your boy. *A function of the trusts is to close opportunity in their lines of action.* No claim ever made by apologists was or is more absurd than that persons are now endowed with equal rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Such condition is impossible where man and master obtain, and never to a higher degree than now.

The plea that Socialists are endeavoring to destroy the government is, therefore, self-evidently absurd. If one but for a moment considers the interdependence of industrial and governmental institutions, he can but perceive that a change in the former necessitates a corresponding modification in the latter. Socialism will eliminate the waste, the needless, the obsolete from both, retaining or adding only as conditions require. If Socialists can ever establish such conditions as will not call for armies of constables, police, sheriffs, detectives, and soldiers, of township, county, state and national officials and courts, and a voluminous press to chronicle the daily record of crime and the doings of these public functionaries in relation thereto, their "destructive" work will certainly be a blessed boon to humanity. Socialists will establish on a permanent basis what capitalism is so surely and rapidly laying waste—a government of, and for, and by the people. This will be their substitute for a

government under absolute sway of the lobbyists and political machines of the exploiters of labor.

V.

PROGRAM, ORGANIZATION AND TACTICS

It is in nowise the intention here to so much as suggest a program for final action in the establishment of a co-operative commonwealth. The European Socialist movement has reached a point that no doubt admits of serious consideration of this matter; but the question that now most concerns Americans is how to convert more people to the revolutionary doctrine, to win adherents to the faith. This is the work that for some time must absorb our efforts.

The Socialist party is the political organization through which all those who demand the abolition of the present system of industry and the substitution therefor of a co-operative system express their demands formally in platforms and through the exercise of the franchise. And since it is evident to the most superficial observer that if the privilege to exploit human labor is ever wrested from its beneficiaries, that task must be accomplished through united action of the exploited masses, it follows that the Socialist party is necessarily the medium of political expression of at least the ultimate interests of the entire laboring class. That much all will admit who are at all agreed upon the matter of necessity for a change of system, and who are sufficiently informed to express an intelligent opinion concerning that change. For certainly it is not rational to assume that any party

or political organization that is fostered by any faction of the exploiting class could entertain the proposition of annihilation of the privileges of that class. And it is likewise certain that no political party or faction can lay any claim whatever to being Socialist that does not stand unqualifiedly for this fundamental, ultimate demand—that does not stand for the collective ownership of the nation's sources of subsistence, for the total elimination of the exploiter as an industrial factor, for this complete change, this revolution in industrial methods. Any political organization, no matter what its designation or pretenses, either stands squarely and unequivocally for this, or it does not stand for it—is either Socialist or capitalist. There is no middle ground; the demarkation is absolute. As has already been shown, the advocates of the public ownership of one or a few things have no more thought of incorporating this fundamental proposition in their schemes for “reform” than have the other capitalist bodies. If this were a part of their program, they would at once discern that their side-shows are superfluous and join with the Socialists.

It is this all-essential and ultimate demand that absolutely divorces the Socialist party from all other political organizations. The demand is revolutionary. This designation must not be misinterpreted. The popular conception of this term “revolution” that identifies it with violence and public uprisings is erroneous. The word is used by Socialists with perfect propriety to denote an entire change in industrial methods and in contradistinction to the word “reform” that signifies simply some modification of the existing order. All Socialists demand an industrial revolution, but violence is no part of their

program. If violence accompanies this change of system, capitalists must be responsible for it.

It is this revolutionary demand that makes fusion or coalition of Socialists with any other party or faction impossible. A mere reform movement is easily merged into or captured by an older and stronger organization. A minority party whose membership's interests are not seriously menaced by the demands of the reformers has but to incorporate in its platform sufficient of those demands to strangle the reformers' efforts; and this is the universal policy pursued. The absorption and consequent annihilation of the "greenback" and later of the "populist" organizations by the democrats is a monumental example of the fate of middle-class or reform movements. There was nothing in either that was fundamentally prohibitive of democratic encroachment, and the democrats needed votes. But the revolutionary demand of the Socialists bars all advances or seductive allurements that can emanate from capitalistic sources. It establishes a boundary that nothing of capitalist origin can cross. They may absorb all else in the Socialist platform and they have at most but captured a skirmish line. The main force and reserves are still unscathed.

But the establishment of a co-operative commonwealth, the consummation of the revolutionary processes now in full swing in industry, is an end toward which all else verges. This implies the use of means to that end. And it is over the question as to what constitutes proper, logical, consistent and efficient modes of procedure in propaganda and in political action—what constitutes the best means to the end sought—that socialists are often divided. Regarding the one great end and aim, they are a unit; as to the best means of accomplishing that end,

very naturally, they have not been a unit. There are numerous and various lines of action that are more or less plausible and of possible results, so that whenever and wherever a point is raised that is purely tactical, varying shades of opinion are generally forthcoming. In some of the European countries and even in the United States, so pronounced has been the contention over this question of tactics that it has at times divided the Socialist forces to such a degree as to place two or more sets of candidates before the electors in many parts of the nation. The constant tendency, however, is to a definite policy. In this country and on the continent of Europe, serious differences have practically been submerged—a natural consequence of investigation and experiment.

This much is definitely decided, that the Socialist party shall everywhere and at all times stand unequivocally for the interests of the proletariat, the producing class, both in their ultimate aim and in their immediate needs. It is to this class that it must make its appeal. It is from the ranks of labor that it must, in by far the largest measure, recruit; it is exploited humanity that must ultimately carry the party to victory and thus insure their own emancipation. It is essentially the party of the laboring class; it could not be otherwise and exist at all. Therefore, it at all times looks to labor's interests. All immediate demands (and they are numerous) have but one aim—for something that will redound to the betterment of labor's condition. This thought permeates every paragraph of every platform, national, state or local. Better educational facilities, free text-books and even provision for meals for the needy pupils; better wages for laborers on all forms of public work or improvement; the maintenance at public expense of free

employment agencies; the rights of the poor to counsel in the courts; the rights of labor to organize, defend their standard of subsistence and secure, if possible, a larger share of their labor-product; pensions for the needy aged; publicly owned and comparatively free bath houses, gymnasiums, theaters and such other institutions as should be within easy reach of all; public ownership and operation of all municipal franchises; the vesting of power in the hands of the people through the initiative and referendum in legislation and the right of recall of public officials; aid for laborers while in conflict with their capitalist masters; defense of the proletariat in their contests for what has long been conceded as their constitutional rights to free speech, free assembly and an uncorrupted, unabridged franchise—in all of these matters or in any others wherein labor has a direct or even an indirect interest, it finds an unfailing advocate in the Socialist. In the countries and municipalities wherein the Socialists have gained a power with which capitalists have to reckon, or complete ascendancy, they have already put many of these measures into operation. And ever and always the Socialist is urging, pleading with labor to use its franchise to place its own representatives in positions of authority—pleading for independent political action.

Thus it is that the Socialist platform is logically arranged in two parts—one dealing with the general and universal mission of the party, the other with its immediate demands. These demands necessarily vary materially in different countries and even in different parts of the same country. This circumstance and the relative prominence given these demands by the adverse critics of Socialism gives rise to the misconception that there

are different kinds of Socialism in different localities—an error due to deliberate misrepresentation and false statement or to the mistaking of the means for accomplishing a purpose for the purpose itself.

The Socialist party organization consists of, first, a national executive committee of seven members and a national secretary, all elected by the entire party membership of the nation; second, a national committee now consisting of from one to three members in each organized state or territory, the apportionment being according to the numerical strength of the party in the various political divisions, all elected by the membership of their respective states; third, of local organizations everywhere, designated as "Locals;" and members "at large" who have not opportunity to join a Local, but affiliate with the party through a state secretary or the national office. The various state organizations are modeled closely after that of the nation. Members of Locals or "at large" are designated as "members of the party" and each pays a small monthly assessment called "dues," five cents of which goes to the national office, from five to ten cents to the state organization and the remainder to his Local. These dues furnish the funds that run the entire machinery of the party, except when some special emergency makes necessary a special assessment or a call for voluntary contributions. Itemized statements of all receipts and expenditures of whatever nature are monthly published by the national and by the various state offices and sent to every Local in the nation or state, respectively. Constitutions, platforms and resolutions, and all official declarations of the party are referred to the entire membership for their approval or rejection and their decision is final; and any act of any official or any body of officials must, on demand, be referred to the entire constituency affected by such act for

their concurrence or disapproval. Under direct supervision of the national office are two bureaus—one supervising a corps of national lecturers and organizers, the other collecting and distributing literature and propaganda material.

These are the main features of the organization. Simple as it is, it is thorough and something entirely novel in American politics. It is a political machine of which any one, regardless of sex, color or creed, may become a member by declaring allegiance to the principles of the party and entire renunciation of adherence to any other political organization. Should a member so far wander from grace as to desire to act with or hold an official position under any other party whatsoever, he must withdraw from his Local. Nothing that savors of fusion or compromise is tolerated on the part of any body of Socialists or even of one member. History and experience have taught the Socialists that this is the only course that they can pursue and retain their integrity. To be sure this is confusing, astonishing to the political "pie-hunters" of capitalism, but there is far too much in the Socialist cause to be wasted on such as they.

Yes, it is a political machine, and yet so organized and conducted that rings, or cliques, or bosses are impossible of successful formation, or operation, or installation. It is a political machine that can carry on no star chamber proceedings, whose every act must conform to the will of the majority and whose entire doings are necessarily as open to inspection as is a public document. It holds more meetings than any other organization in the nation and not a meeting is ever secret—never one behind barred doors. Its forum is always open to him who wishes to mount it, and the inquisitive or seeker after information is always a welcome guest.

As might be expected, the organized membership of the

party is far short of its voting strength. This is its deepest source of regret. If those who have advanced so far as to line up with the party on election day could but realize how much it means to them to acquire the knowledge and training gained from the work of a Local, how little it means to each financially and yet how much their numerous mites mean to the organization as a whole, the membership would at once increase many fold. It would seem that any person acting in any manner or capacity with a movement of such momentous import would be ambitious to learn of its doings, its methods of work, the lessons it has to impart, and to share in its comradeship. The only way to do this as it should be done is to join a Local and attend its meetings. If one does this and constantly reads a couple of the party's best papers, he will soon begin to comprehend something of what this mighty movement really means.

The mission of the Socialist party in America has been, and, in the absence of some still unforeseen circumstance that might thrust it prominently into power, will for some time continue to be, chiefly to carry on propaganda work, to spread the lessons gleaned from industry and history among the people. Its membership well understand that the human race is rapidly moving toward the abolition of the present system of industry—to the culmination of a revolution in industrial methods. And it is well here to note that the replacement of the present system by one of co-operation will be nothing but the *culmination* of a revolution; because the revolution that receives so much emphasis in the teachings of Socialists has already been wrought by forces over which they have no control. These forces that make the change imperative are found in industrial and governmental organizations. The revolution is being worked out, in fact has already been wrought through the medium of machinery by

the economic and political dominance of the captains of industry. They have demonstrated the inadequacy of the present system and made necessary the change that must follow—they have accomplished the revolution. What remains is to get the people ready for the transfer of system; to teach the people, first, the real significance of what is now taking place under their immediate observation, and, second, the proper mode of procedure in consummating the change. To the first part of this two-fold task the Socialist party is now chiefly directing its effort. It will take up the second part formally whenever and wherever conditions require. It will not, or at least it is not necessary that it should, waste energy on the matter of preparation to cross a stream until nearness of approach calls for preparatory steps.

As previously stated, the means for consummating this revolution are incorporated in our constitution and law—in what is now our bill of rights. Fundamental among these rights is that to cast a vote and have it counted as cast—that is, the right of the majority to determine the entire course of government. Whether this right has ever been fully appreciated and exercised or not—whether elections here and there have been stolen and the voice of the people thwarted—is not here a matter for consideration. It is laid down as fundamental to our system of government and as such it is going to be strictly adhered to to the end. Our people are learning to use the ballot and, when circumstances compel them to act, they will see to it that the majority shall govern. But, in any event, whether this right is preserved in its purity or not—whether or not the capitalist class will submit to the results of lawful, constitutional procedure on the part of the exploited masses—the Socialist recognizes as a primal necessity the proper mental equipment of at least a well rounded majority of our people. This is a matter

that can be ascertained even if labor is disfranchised. And this mental equipment does not mean that each one of that majority must possess an intimate knowledge of the philosophy of Socialism; but that they at least shall be brought to understand the course of industrial evolution, be made to realize the exploitation that is now practiced upon them and the proper course of conduct to secure what, in justice, belongs to them. When they have acquired that knowledge, they will know far more of economics, far more of their function as citizens of a republic, far more of capitalism, and of Socialism than has ever been within the comprehension of any majority responsible for the continuance of the present system of industry and the governmental institutions necessary to its propagation. In short, it will be the most intelligent majority that has ever had anything to say about the affairs of this nation.

It is through this majority that the Socialist hopes to capture the powers of government, to wrest that power from the hand of the exploiter and vest producing humanity with supreme control. He knows that he will gain that majority only as the masses are enlightened; therefore, he is always and everywhere a propagandist. It is not to produce a revolution that he works; he leaves that to capitalism. But he does seek to direct it into proper channels. He knows that the privilege of the exploiter must go and to the teaching of what that means he bends every effort. His cry is: "Organize. Lead the millions into right lines of action. Bring men and women together in counsel; teach the lessons of evolution, economics and the class struggle. Train voters for an intelligent use of the ballot; develop the solidarity of the laboring class."

Nor is their membership by any means confined to wage workers. Every profession, station and calling in life is

well represented in their Locals.* Business and professional men constitute a marked percentage of their most active and influential workers. Several men of wealth, reputed millionaires, in defiance of the ostracism of their class, have joined them; and others are working to the same purpose through such organizations as the Christian Socialists, Collectivist Leagues, etc. Nor is this at all surprising. The riches of men cannot in all cases blind them in their interpretation of contemporaneous history. There is no fatal reason why a rich man should not discern the course of the revolution that is working itself out as the consequence of the system that made possible his possessions. Doubtless thousands have already been brought to this state of mind who lack the moral courage to openly state their convictions. They may possess a few thousands, a few hundreds of thousands, or even a few millions only to feel their relative insignificance in the great gambling game of capitalism, with its marked cards and loaded dice. Or they may discern that, at its best, the game is not worth the playing; that what the nation needs is men, not millionaires. These smaller fish of the financial sea are tempting bait for the great scavengers; and, as the industries concentrate, as the gigantic octopi throw out their mighty tentacles, the hopelessness of successful combat with such power is too apparent to all to escape the vigilant eye of the smaller holder of wealth. The insecurity of himself and his

* The National Office reports the following interesting statistics regarding the membership of the Socialist Party in the United States:

Nationalities Represented—Native born Americans constitute 71%; Germans, 8½%; English, 4%; Scandinavians, 5%; all others, 11½%.

Occupation of membership—Laborers and Craftsmen, 61%; farmers, 17%; commerce, 9%; professional men, 5%; all others, 8%.

Politics Before Joining the Socialists—Democrats, 40%; Republicans, 35%; Populists, 15%; all others, 10%.

children cannot but assert itself. Again, riches cannot in all cases steel the heart of man against the cruel inhumanities of the present order nor eclipse the vision of its inevitable overthrow. Of course, as a class, the rich will not join in the abrogation of their own privilege, but that the Socialists will, ere long, number many of them in their ranks, seems a certainty. Even economic determinism makes strange bed-fellows.

As for the small business man, there is little left in capitalism to hold him in its grasp. The multiplying millions that must annually go into business in some form—the dividends of the great concerns for which investments must be found—are bound to make and are making inroads into his opportunity to garner a part of the exploited product of labor. The tremendous increases in the business of the mail order houses, the growing disposition to eliminate the jobber and the retailer as well, is already beginning to be felt and can but multiply as the years go by. The cream of business is being gathered by these big concerns; the dregs are all that will be left to the local trade. This does not imply that the small traders will markedly decrease in number, either actually or relatively, but does mean that their returns will fall as business drifts to the great centers. They will however cling as long as it is possible to obtain subsistence, for even that is preferable to a labor market that they are not qualified to invade and that at best offers no opportunity for betterment of their condition. The recruiting of the Socialist ranks from this source is in no sense irregular.

And thus the Socialist ranks are swelling every hour; nor can it be otherwise. Everywhere one hears the admission that "something must be done to stay the ravenous hand of greed and provide means for the subsistence of the people." But "what must be done?" is a question that meets no more

intelligent reply from capitalist sources than "have confidence," "God knows," or a request to elect some politicians to office. The Socialist is the only one who meets the question squarely and tells the interrogator that when the people learn to produce things for themselves and not for exploiters the "something" will be done. The nation must own its sources of subsistence; the privilege of the exploiter must go.

To the thousand and one petty questions as to "how do you propose to do this, that and the other," the Socialist can reply truthfully and comprehensively that he proposes to establish a government of the people who will decide these matters as Socialists now decide all questions that arise in their own organization, "as the majority determines." If the majority errs, let it correct its error. It will not long deliberately do injury to itself, nor can it, in a condition of equal opportunity, inflict more wrong upon a minority than the majority must suffer. When the masses are enlightened, when they are purged of the capitalistic superstitions and fetich worship in which they are now shrouded, when the burdens of such governmental matters as must be maintained are thrust directly upon them, self-inflicted injury will be of short duration.

Socialists do not know every matter of detail of a co-operative commonwealth, nor is it necessary at this stage of its development that they should; but they know more about it than did our Revolutionary sires of the sort of governmental organization that they were to establish up to the very hour of its formation. Whenever it becomes necessary to take a step in the establishment of one or more institutions, the step will be taken; if in a wrong direction, it can easily be retraced and a true course established. We have faith in

humanity when it is once liberated—and we have faith in its ability and determination to accomplish its liberty.

VI.

CRITICS

In nothing is the weakness of the defense of capitalism more vividly portrayed than in the diatribes of the adverse critics of Socialism. A common characteristic of the essays of these critics is to set up a "straw man," label it "Socialism" and then proceed to demolish it. All the diabolisms of the present system are the regular attributes of this apparition; and if these are not sufficient for the purpose in hand, then all the personal weaknesses or shortcomings, real or apparent, of an individual or two who somewhere or sometime advocated Socialism, communism or anarchism, are conjured up as the regular and orthodox teachings and practices of all who oppose the established order. National platforms and official declarations that have received the formal sanction of the entire party and the standard and up to date authorities everywhere are passed by as matters of no moment; somebody, somewhere, some time said so and so or did so and so, and that settles the whole matter beyond dispute for the entire race of Socialists and for the system of industry and popular government that they propose to establish. When advocates are driven to such straits, it is ample evidence that facts and logic fail them. Their only available substitutes are misrepresentation and abuse.

For instance, Socialists are charged with desiring to take the property of the nation and divide it up among the people. The author would apologize for any reference to

this absurdity did not even so prominent a personage as our president, the Hon. William H. Taft, make the charge. The self-evident impossibility of such a thing is sufficient to refute it. How could they divide up the railroads, mines, factories, etc.? Socialists demand their collective ownership—the diametrical opposite of any sort of partition of the concerns. If collective ownership has any such meaning as Mr. Taft attributes to the desire of the Socialists, he should, to be consistent, at once demand his share of our post offices and school buildings. Possibly he is a philanthropist.

Let us look a moment at the facts. The entire real and personal property of this nation is valued at about one hundred billions of dollars. The annual product of the nation's labor is rated at nearly forty billions.* It is the privilege of dividing up this forty billions that constitutes capitalism. Capitalism divides it as we have seen. The exploiters fatten upon the division—but the producers don't. It is this division that Socialism will stop; and that is wherein it speaks death to capitalism. Socialists will divide that product among the producers of it and on the basis of justice; therefore, there will be nothing for an exploiter. The privilege of the exploiters that we would abolish is their power to compel producing humanity to submit to this annual division in order to live. When one contemplates the magnitude of that annual labor-product that capitalists so largely divide among themselves, it makes their hundred billions of taxable property look rather insignificant. It is through the private ownership of a large part of the hundred billions that capitalists hold control of the annually repeated forty billions,

*The statistician, Lucien Sanial, in what he issues as a conservative estimate of the nation's annual labor product, places it, for 1907, at thirty-six billions of dollars.

and without the privilege of carving the latter the ownership of the former would be worthless.

Not long since a certain eastern Professor went over a large part of this country "demonstrating" that labor does not produce all wealth and incidentally "demolishing" Socialism. In a suit for the annulment of his marriage, it developed that for some time Standard Oil had been paying him \$15,000 per year for his expert knowledge of political economy. That fee would qualify a man of elastic conscience for the "demonstration" or "demolition" of almost any sort of ism. Since then some light has been thrown upon the methods of "labor" by which the oil magnates of 26 Broadway "produce" their wealth, but Standard did not pay for the revelations.

Another charge laid against Socialism is that it will destroy the home. This charge is indefinite as it may relate to the material home—the possession of a habitation—or to the relations between man, woman and child that should characterize a home.

If the charge has any reference to the destruction of home possession, there is little ground for fear of anything that Socialists may do, as capitalism has well nigh completed that work. It will soon leave little to destroy. The "Abstract of Twelfth Census" (pages 133-135) tells us that of all the "homes" in New York city (Manhattan) 94 per cent are rented; of Boston 81.1 per cent, of Chicago 75 per cent, of Philadelphia, "the city of homes," 78 per cent, and so on throughout the nation. Leaving the cities, the same authority informs us that already 52 per cent of the farmers of the country do not own the farms they work. Robert Hunter, an authority on such matters, asserts: "Probably no wage-earners in Manhattan own their homes, and in several other large cities probably 99 per cent of the wage-

earners are propertyless and involved in a weekly indebtedness for rent of from one-fifth to two-fifths of their earnings, regardless of whether they have work or not." When the actual condition of the homes of this nation is thus laid before us, the scene is so marked by tragedy that one has not even a smile for those who play this indignant role of critic. When the exploiters are off the industrial field, when labor gets its own, there will be some opportunity for home ownership in America; but certainly not till then.

The second phase of this charge against Socialism—that it will destroy the relations necessary to the maintenance of families and homes—forces the apologists for capitalism into strange contentions. The Socialists demand the absolute right of a producer to the product of his labor—that a laborer shall be permitted to produce as much as he pleases and have its social equivalent as his reward. This means the economic independence of men and women—liberation from wage slavery. The critics argue that this condition would destroy proper human relations; would cause men and women to cease to wed because they loved each other—in other words, qualification to possess and fit up homes would disqualify people to properly occupy them. No other meaning can attach to this contention than that to maintain a proper standard of morality, to keep men and women in "their proper spheres," it is necessary to keep them in economic dependence, in a condition of servitude. For evident it is that Socialism makes no demand on behalf of man or woman except that an industrial system shall be established that shall insure economic freedom. If we are to believe these critics, subordination, dependency, servitude—unqualified species of slavery—constitute a condition essential to chastity. The condition thus constituted certainly is essential to capitalist dividends, to the continuance of the sys-

tem of exploitation; but wherein it is necessary to the development of a well rounded manhood or womanhood has not as yet been made apparent.

The home-destroying charge is put in the form of a declaration that Socialists seek to establish a system of "free love." What is meant is "free lust," such as is now so extensively practiced among the people who have little to do but squander the millions that others produce. As no body of Socialists ever expressed a desire for such a system of conjugal relations, evidence that they entertain any such ideas must be sought entirely outside all their official declarations. Then one must look to the conduct of the Socialists themselves. There are hundreds of thousands of them in this country and millions of them in other lands. They are your neighbors and friends everywhere. They are prominent in all the walks of life. Is there any other class of people among whom there is so small a per cent of criminals or insane or drunkards or suicides or unfaithful husbands or wives—among whom there is anything to warrant so infamous a charge as even an ex-president labors to lay against them? You probably know some or may have heard of some who have varied from the path of rectitude. Well, average them up with the members of other parties and you will find the balance decidedly in their favor. But it is a function of the capitalist apologist to magnify out of all proportion every shortcoming on the part of a Socialist and to attribute his every failing to his politics. They seem wholly to overlook the fact that the Socialists of today must be made out of democrats and republicans—the only source of raw material. From the tenor of their discourses one would conclude that they expect Socialists to take these products of capitalist environment and transmute them into models for paradise. Our ambition is to teach them the

truth in all things as nearly as it can be ascertained and wholly uncorrupted by any capitalistic taint or trimmings. This can have but one effect—to broaden their field of thought and action and make them better men and women. In this the Socialists have been remarkably successful.

When one contemplates the horrors of the capitalistic slums with their millions of humanity, wherein thousands of families occupy but one room to the family; the qualifications for home life imparted in sweatshop, factory and mine; the hundreds of thousands in the "red-light" districts whose condition is as directly traceable to capitalism as malaria is to swamps; the millions of men who by labor conditions are disqualified to possess a home or support a family and the corresponding number of women who consequently cannot possibly wed; the debaucheries and illicit relations that figure so conspicuously in "high life"; the marriages based solely upon expediency, diplomacy, and bargain and sale that are almost as numerous as the rich, the gentry, the nobility and the "blood royal"—when one looks upon capitalism as it really is and beholds the home drifting out of human life at a rate never before witnessed in the world's history, the charge that this institution is endangered by those who would establish a system of justice, who would terminate the legalized robberies of organized vultures and liberate the slaves of industry, is too self-apparently absurd to find advocates anywhere except around the altar of Mammon.

Again, it is charged against Socialists that they are trying to destroy religion. To the student of history this charge has a very familiar ring. The same charge sent Socrates to his death. Under the same indictment the early Christians met every form of torture from the cross to the arena. It was this identical "argument" that was urged

against those who first offered proof of the earth's rotation and of its annual circuit of the sun. Many goodly intentioned and many badly and all foolishly intentioned people could see nothing but a direct attack upon everything sacred in such theories as that of gravitation, of the conservation of energy, of evolution in plant and animal life, and the lessons of the rocks as read by the geologists. The abominable teachings of those who advocated the abolition of chattel slavery were often characterized as sacrilege of deepest hue. Even the relation of railways and the telegraph to the souls of men was in some instances formally announced as inimical.*

During the propagation of each of these great truths, there were attacks upon the teaching of some creeds; but those attacks were made by the early advocates of the revolutionary theory as a matter of self-defense against the onslaughts of the adherents of the creed. In each case the scientific thinkers felt that they were advancing a great truth and they were forced to defend that truth against all adversaries. They knew that all truths are harmoniously related; apparent discrepancies call for investigation and, finally, for re-adjustment of theories. Most of the creeds have now adapted their teachings to all of these great discoveries and admit the folly of their former contentions.

The Socialist party is a political organization and as

*The school board at Lancaster, Ohio, in 1828, refused to permit the school house to be used for the discussion of the question as to whether railroads were practical or not, and the matter was recently called to mind by an old document that reads as follows: "You are welcome to use the school house to debate all proper questions in, but such things as railroads and telegraphs are impossibilities and rank infidelity. There is nothing in the Word of God about them. If God had designed that his intelligent creatures should travel at the frightful speed of fifteen miles an hour, by steam, he would have clearly foretold through his holy prophets. It is a device of Satan to lead immortal souls down to hell."

such enrolls among its members representatives of every shade of religious belief. In qualifying for membership, no thought of religious test is anywhere contemplated. No Local would be so presumptuous as to attempt to impose such a condition. On matters political, a member must hew to the line; on matters religious, he follows his own inclinations. There may be some, but the author personally knows of none who have changed their religious beliefs after joining the Socialist party.

On the question of what will be the effect upon religious institutions of establishing a co-operative commonwealth, one may philosophize, but he cannot affirm. If their retention is contingent upon some form of industrial servitude, on the relation of man and master, they certainly must go, If they cannot survive in a land of industrially free beings, they are not worthy of preservation. Is the church ready to admit that its life-current courses through the veins of capitalism? It certainly is not a unit in such admission. The Christian Socialist Fellowship, that numbers in its ranks hundreds of ministers and members of all creeds, among them leaders of religious thought and activity, declares in Article 2 of its Constitution: "Its object shall be to permeate churches, denominations and other religious institutions with the social message of Jesus; to show that Socialism is the economic expression of the Christian life; to end the class struggle and establish industrial democracy and to hasten the reign of justice and brotherhood upon earth." Ex-President Roosevelt is among those who assume the role of spiritual adviser for these hundreds of splendid, manly men and warns them as per the following insult to decency: "As for the so-called Christian Socialists who associate themselves with the movement, they either are or ought to be aware of the pornographic (of or pertaining

to the obscene) literature, the pornographic propaganda, which make up one side of the movement."* The brazen effrontery of the man in assuming that these men of the cloth do not know enough to know that their own lives and teachings, as well as those of their hundreds of thousands of comrades, stamp this accusation as false and hypocritical, is equalled only by his further assumption of ignorance on the part of his readers as to the most common consequences of the environment in which he has spent a greater part of his life. For whether the words were written in Washington or in New York, within a mile radius of where they were penned and among his political tribes and clansmen, there is more that is pornial (licentious) transpiring every day than among all the millions of Socialists of the world in a decade. And capitalism is written over it all—the capitalism that Mr. Roosevelt is defending.

If civilization is to be perpetuated, the present sysytem of industry must give way to one of physical and mental liberty. We say physical and mental liberty, because they are inseparable; the one cannot exist without the other. Truth, or at least the nearest approach to it that human beings can attain, is the only thing that can endure the tests of experience and experiment. All there is that is wholesome, all that is true, all that contributes to the up-building of a pure, free manhood and womanhood will survive in the coming order; and that is surely all that should survive.

Another foolish charge that is brought against Socialism is that it has always failed wherever it has been tried.

*Prof. Albion W. Small, of Chicago University, says of this tirade: "I am not a Socialist myself, but I think it is a mistake for those who are not Socialists to misrepresent the Socialistic doctrines, because it gives those of that faith the idea that their opponents are not sincere."

The answer to this criticism is found in the fact that it has never been tried. Men like Plato, Sir Thomas More, Robert Owen and even Edward Bellamy dreamed of a communistic state in which all products of labor were a common possession and each privileged to help himself as he might see fit. Even Christ, the apostles and the early church fathers held economic ideas that were decidedly communistic. Robert Owen and some others endeavored to establish and maintain colonies based on this ideal state. They vainly hoped that these little groups planted in the midst of capitalist countries and with all the guns of plutocracy trained upon them might flourish, spread and finally absorb a nation and the world. With them, communism was to come, very largely if not entirely, as a result of men's desires to establish an ideal state of humanity—a thought incompatible with Socialist philosophy.

Socialism is not a consequence of philosophic dreams any more than is a certain type of plant or animal. It is a product of evolution in economic institutions. It is a child of necessity, not of speculative philosophy. It must come as a means of adaptation of industrial methods to industrial environment. It is that toward which the whole process of supplying the needs of the human race is irresistibly drifting. It is not a human invention; it is a historical discovery. It is not an ideal to be worked out in some isolated or non-isolated colony; it is a system of industry as world wide as capitalism itself. It is not communism any more than it is capitalism or anarchy. Socialism may evolve into communism, but that is wholly a matter for the people of a Socialist world to determine. It is no concern of ours. Evolutionary processes move by steps and, despite the theory of the sudden changes in life-forms, as advanced by the

"mutationists," we are not justified in expecting these processes to jump fences.

"Then," says another critic, "Socialists are not consistent. Your co-operative commonwealth must come a step at a time. We must gain municipal ownership of water, gas, lighting, street railways, etc.; then government ownership of railways, telegraphs and telephones, then steel plants, and so on to the end. You cannot get it all at once." Looked at superficially, this criticism seems logical. And more, it is logical, for the co-operative commonwealth has for years past been ripening to fullness just that way and will so continue to ripen. With the people of the United States, it has already passed through most of these preliminary steps. There are few if any Socialists in America who have not evolved through all the various phases of municipal and governmental ownership—"step by step." Each reasoned himself through these phases "one at a time," and many indeed of them even through the colony phase. Three-fourths of the people of our great cities have, no doubt, long since been convinced of the necessity for municipal ownership of various franchises—five-sixths of Chicago have already voted for ownership of her street railways. But five-sixths of Chicago are not Socialists by any means. They have simply evolved through some of the preliminary steps necessary to arrive at Socialism. The fact that they did not accomplish their desired object, that they were bounced out of their right to govern that city—to run its industrial affairs or what should be their own affairs—by the political henchmen and courts of capitalism, does not in the least lessen the degree or extent to which they have evolved along the lines that lead to a co-operative commonwealth. In fact their defeat through the machinations of those who operate the capitalistic governmental machinery but adds

impetus to their progress. A large majority of the people of this nation have already, "step by step," evolved through the government-ownership-of-railways stages and are now preparing for the next advance.

It is certainly evident that the evolutionary process does not require the actual accomplishment of "each step" before another can be taken. When a person has reached the "municipal ownership" stage of development, it is but a brief step to the national phase and so on. The last "step" is taken when one perceives that our economic problems have their common bases in the privilege of labor exploitation—in the private ownership of the nation's sources of subsistence. He then perceives the revolutionary outcome of the evolutionary processes through which he has gradually been passing, and that the world movement now on has for its purpose, not the acquisition of an industry here and there to be operated through the medium of the politicians and bosses and grafters of capitalist organizations, but the liberation of the race from the bondage of the exploiter. When he has absorbed that fact, there is no thought more repulsive to him than that of attempting to organize a national party, work it into a majority against the powers of concentrated wealth, secure control of our national House, hold that through the long and tedious process of gaining supremacy in the Senate, elect and inaugurate a president, wait an age in order to change the complexion of the Supreme Court, all to gain one point, to partially develop one phase in an evolutionary process and that a phase through which he and the nation evolved long ago. He perceives that to actually accomplish, for instance, government ownership of railroads, every force that capitalism can muster—the precinct and ward heelers, the city machine, the county machine, the state and national machines, the capitalist

owned and subsidized press, the purchasable power of oratory, the intimidating influences of the great employers of labor, the corrupting force of multiplied millions in campaign funds—this all-pervading and tremendous enginry of capitalism must be beaten, vanquished in detail and in totality. As that is just what must be done and all that must be done in order to consummate the revolution, why waste so much energy and effort on a mere trifle?

There is nothing abnormal in the evolutionary processes that are working out the social and industrial revolution. Step by step the impending change is being wrought out to fullness. The successive strides lengthen in geometrical ratio and they are all toward a common goal. The adverse critics cry "halt," but the cry is unheeded. Nor can it escape notice that none of them seem disposed to offer a defense of capitalism. Not one has the temerity to tell us that he defends the present system because it is right, that he pleads its cause because it is just, that such slavery as the wage system imposes—"the most refined system of slavery known to human history"—is the condition that the masses should inherit, not one dares present the capitalist system as it is and defend it on its merits. No such task is essayed. The straw man, mud slinging, and the caricature that must be labeled for identification better serves their purpose. The real question at issue, the great thought that is moving the world, the evolutionary processes that are undermining the system that the critic seeks to perpetuate as obviously as anything in nature or in human affairs could be obvious, are all unheeded. And advisedly so. These are not congenial topics to discuss from the standpoint of the privileged, even if the critic were sufficiently informed to intelligently discuss them. His hope of success lies in his play of misrepresentation and vilification (either intentional

or ignorant) upon the minds of the uninformed and prejudiced. He is emboldened in his attack by the consciousness that the applause of the "powers that be" awaits his effort, that their myriad channels of "information" are open to him and closed to his adversary—and he accordingly does his worst.

But despite all defamation and scurrilous onslaught, despite contemptuous sneer or conspiracy of silence or suppression, despite all inroads that can be devised upon the rights of free speech, free press, free assembly and the franchise, the revolution moves constantly forward in its inevitable course. Capitalism's frantic efforts to stay it are foredoomed to failure for the reason that its impelling forces are the constituent elements of capitalism itself. Socialists are no more responsible for the forces that are so rapidly overturning the present system of industry than they are responsible for the economic class struggle in which it must go down. They seek to portray the inherent qualities of that system that make Socialism a necessity. They have but discovered the grand resultant of the developing forces of human institutions and the consequent human relations that through these institutions must be established and maintained.